

Clearwater, Florida, February 6, 2014

The Unified Personnel Board (UPB) met in regular session 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; Ricardo Davis, Vice-Chair; Keith Bailey; Andrea S. Daggett; Keith C. Dekle; Angela Outten; and Joan Vecchioli.

Also Present: Peggy Rowe, Director of Human Resources; Michelle A. Wallace, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Arlene L. Smitke, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk; and other interested individuals.

AGENDA

Personnel Board

Item I. New Business

1. Approval of the Appointment of Personnel Board Appointee.
2. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Unified Personnel Board.

EAC

Item II. Employee Advisory Council Representative

Human Resources

Item III. Consent Agenda

Request Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Personnel Board Meeting held December 5, 2013.

Human Resources

Item IV. Informational Items

1. Action Taken Under Authority Delegated by the Unified Personnel Board to the Human Resources Director.
2. The Pinellas County Human Resources 2013 Annual Report: *On Course*

Human Resources

Item V. Presentation

Employee Survey Results

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.

NEW BUSINESS

Reappointment of Ricardo Davis to the Unified Personnel Board – Approved

Upon motion by Ms. Vecchioli, seconded by Mr. Dekle and carried, Ricardo Davis was re-appointed to serve as the Personnel Board appointee for a two-year term.

Daniel M. Andriso Re-Elected as Chair of the Unified Personnel Board and Ricardo Davis Elected as Vice-Chair for Calendar Year 2014

Referring to the election of officers, Chair Andriso called for nominations for the offices of Chair and Vice-Chair for calendar year 2014.

Upon nomination by Mr. Davis, seconded by Ms. Vecchioli and carried, Mr. Andriso was re-elected to serve as Chair.

Upon nomination by Chair Andriso, seconded by Ms. Vecchioli and carried, Mr. Davis was re-elected to serve as Vice-Chair.

EMPLOYEES' ADVISORY COUNCIL (EAC) REPRESENTATIVE

EAC Representative Lisa Wombles reported that the EAC met with the Appointing Authorities on December 16; that the 2014 officers include Charles Toney, Chair; Richard Carvale, Vice-Chair, and Hazel Lane, Secretary; and that she continues to serve as a Representative, as no one else in her work area expressed an interest in serving.

Responding to query by Ms. Vecchioli, Ms. Rowe related that although most Appointing Authorities and many managers view their willingness to serve in a favorable light, EAC Representatives do not receive any compensation.

In response to query by Chair Andriso, Ms. Wombles discussed the Employee Advocate Program, indicating that there are currently six Advocates, having dropped from a high of 19; that many had changed jobs or taken on additional responsibilities, some left the County, some did not wish to continue, and although the Appointing Authorities approve of the program, some felt they were getting pushback from their superiors. She indicated that Advocate candidates are interviewed to ensure that they do not have a hidden agenda against management; and that it is important that everyone follow the rules. Mr. Dekle pointed out that while the Advocates are given some training, none have legal experience; that if there are too many, they never have enough cases to become experienced; and that if there are too few, the caseload is

February 6, 2014

burdensome and interferes with their ability to do their job; whereupon, Ms. Wombles stated that, like any volunteer activity, much of the work is done on their own time.

Discussion continued, and Ms. Rowe and Human Resources Manager Jim Valliere provided input regarding the Advocate program, noting that the caseload fluctuates; and that some Advocates are more skilled and are in higher demand; whereupon, Ms. Rowe indicated that staff will continue to look for ways to get more people involved in the program.

Ms. Wombles related that Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller Ken Burke had spoken at the last EAC Delegate meeting; and that Human Resources Manager Laura Berkowitz had presented the employee survey results; whereupon, she welcomed Camille Evans to the Human Resources Department, noting that Ms. Evans is involved in the referral process for employees wishing to obtain an Advocate.

CONSENT AGENDA – APPROVED

Minutes of regular meeting held December 5, 2013, approved.

Motion	-	Mr. Bailey
Second	-	Ms. Vecchioli
Vote	-	7 – 0

INFORMATION ITEMS

Human Resources Director Action Taken Under Authority Delegated by the UPB

Chair Andriso referred to the document titled Human Resources Director Action Taken Under Authority Delegated by the Unified Personnel Board, which has been attached and made a part of the minutes, and indicated that the item lists the actions taken by the Human Resources Director during the period December 1, 2013 through January 24, 2014, is informational in nature, and requires no action by the Board.

The Pinellas County Human Resources 2013 Annual Report: *On Course*

Ms. Rowe thanked Ms. Berkowitz and other staff members for their efforts in compiling the report, indicating that 2013 was a very busy year for Human Resources; and that she anticipates another busy year with a lot of different activities and changes. Discussion ensued, and Ms. Daggett commented on the employee artwork incorporated into the report;

whereupon, Ms. Rowe related that the Employee Art Show, usually held early in the year, has been postponed until June at the request of the participants.

PRESENTATION

Employee Survey Results

Ms. Rowe indicated that it had been approximately ten years since Pinellas County conducted an employee survey, partly due to the number of changes and reorganizations that have occurred; that it is recommended that employers conduct a survey every year or every two years; that the recent survey will establish a baseline; and that plans are to conduct the same survey every two years going forward.

Ms. Berkowitz related that the County had partnered with the National Research Center, Inc. in November to conduct the survey; that the report provides comparison data for 25 other jurisdictions; that over 2,100 Pinellas County employees responded, 74 percent of the total employee population; and that she is very comfortable with the validity of the findings.

Thereupon, Ms. Berkowitz referred to a document titled *The National Employee Survey, Pinellas County Florida, Employee Survey Results, 2013*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, noting that the respondents were asked to rate 59 aspects of their employment with Pinellas County; and that the results were reported in terms of the percent of positive responses for each of the following Job Characteristic Indices, along with comparisons to outside responses in the National Research Center's Employee Benchmark Database (above, similar to, or below the benchmark).

Job Characteristic Indices

- ▶ Job Satisfaction
- ▶ Communication and Decision-Making
- ▶ Respect and Ethics
- ▶ Wages and Benefits
- ▶ Physical Work Environment
- ▶ Employee-Supervisor Relationship
- ▶ Employee Performance Evaluation
- ▶ Employee Development
- ▶ Work Group Performance
- ▶ Employee Contribution and Fit

Ms. Berkowitz presented highlights of the survey results, noting that 87 percent of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with their jobs; that 93 percent plan to be with the organization a year from now; and that the three lowest scored items related to Linking Pay to Performance, Dealing with Low Performing Employees, and Rewarding High Performing Employees.

Throughout the presentation, Mses. Berkowitz and Rowe responded to queries by the members, relating that:

- ▶ Future surveys will be exactly the same, allowing the ability to compare the results to historical data for Pinellas County, as well as other National Employee Survey participants.
- ▶ The benchmark comparisons are based on ratings of five percent higher or lower than the benchmark for the other 25 jurisdictions. Pinellas County does not know the identity of the other jurisdictions, but only one is in Florida. As the database grows, it will be possible to compare results with jurisdictions of similar size, geographic location, and number of employees.
- ▶ The National Research Center's key concern is to protect the anonymity of the employees, which is essential in achieving a high rate of response. Some small departments or divisions have been combined to protect the identity of the respondents.
- ▶ Data is available by department, and each Appointing Authority was given discretion to decide how they would like their results presented.
- ▶ The Appointing Authorities will implement measures to address negative areas within their various departments. The Human Resources Department will address some of its problem areas by revamping certain Personnel Rules, creating a more interactive performance management process, and determining ways to tie pay to performance. *Ms. Daggett suggested that staff consider incorporating questions from the Gallup Q12 survey, and that it focus on the top three positive aspects identified.*
- ▶ There are a lot of factors involved in the employee performance and satisfaction issues, including the five-year history of no raises, a single payment of \$1,200, and a three-percent increase for all.
- ▶ The County does not have a formal peer coaching or mentoring program, but such a program will be considered.

Ms. Berkowitz indicated that the survey is in its infancy; that the provider wishes to grow participation on a national level; and that the County was able to participate at a very low price and was allowed to ask a few questions at no cost; namely, what employees like least and best about working for Pinellas County and how well the EAC supports the employee's interests to upper management and the UPB. Noting that over 1,700 people had responded, she listed the top five in each category, in no particular order, as follows:

Liked Least

- ▶ Wages; fair wage for work duties.
- ▶ No wage increase for years, then a small increase, then a consistent increase, with no recognition of high performers.
- ▶ Poor performers tolerated, with some employees having a sense of entitlement.
- ▶ Uneven application of rules and policies; a perception of favoritism.
- ▶ Lack of advancement or promotional opportunities.

Liked Best

- ▶ Benefits: time off, health care, retirement, education/tuition reimbursement.
- ▶ Job stability and security.
- ▶ Proud to work for Pinellas County; good work environment.
- ▶ Friendships and relationships with co-workers.
- ▶ Sense of community service; making a difference.

Discussion ensued, and responding to query by Mr. Bailey, Ms. Berkowitz indicated that Human Resources has not been publishing the departmental results, other than to each of the respective Appointing Authorities; and Ms. Rowe indicated that Human Resources has not finalized its analysis of the departmental information; that there appears to be some superstars and some lower performers; that a number of departments have gone through major transformations in recent years; and that she would rather not discuss specific departmental results until she can provide appropriate contextual information.

Responding to query by Ms. Vecchioli, Ms. Berkowitz confirmed that information gathered includes the number of respondents from each department, showing the statistical significance of the ratings. She indicated that field workers and employees not comfortable with computers were given the option of completing a paper-and-pencil survey; and that the response rate was higher than the overall 74-percent, showing that no worker was disenfranchised; whereupon, she referred to a chart titled *Employment and Demographic*

February 6, 2014

Information, indicating that an analysis will be conducted to determine any statistically significant differences among employees of different race, age, or tenure.

During further discussion and responding to queries by Mr. Dekle pertaining to the basis of determining poor performance, Chair Andriso indicated that performance is measured in terms of how well an employee performs a particular job, not by their intelligence or ability to perform other unrelated functions.

Mr. Davis stated that the current survey is a great start; and that part of the value will be the ability to follow trends over time; whereupon, he inquired whether there is a plan to communicate the results to the employees, showing them not only that the organization is interested in their viewpoints but how they propose to address the issues. Ms. Berkowitz related that she has attended approximately 20 departmental meetings and has scheduled another 20 to 30 more; and that some departments are forming small work groups to come up with suggestions for improvement; whereupon, Ms. Rowe indicated that she has begun to incorporate some of the information into her departmental *listening sessions*, and will communicate with the employees on an ongoing basis regarding measures that Human Resources will be taking to address areas where they scored the lowest.

Responding to query by Ms. Daggett, Ms. Berkowitz related that there is not a lot of variation between results for the County and external groups; and that while staff will provide the Appointing Authorities or departments with a graph comparing their results for the ten indices to the overall results for the Unified Personnel System, they are cautious about having one department compare itself to other departments.

Thereupon, responding to query by Mr. Dekle, Ms. Berkowitz related that the survey results are posted on the Human Resources blog site; and that Ms. Rowe emailed the results in a special communication to every employee in the Unified Personnel System prior to their distribution to the departments.

MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION ITEMS RECEIVED

The following miscellaneous information items were received for filing:

1. Management and Supervisory Notes for January and February 2014.
2. Training Schedule for January and February 2014.

February 6, 2014

3. Minutes of the EAC Representative meetings of November 20 and December 18, 2013.
4. Minutes of the EAC Delegate meeting of November 21, 2013.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 P.M.

Chair