

Hilo, Hawaii
Tuesday, July 29, 2003

A special meeting of the Civil Service Commission, County of Hawaii, was held in the conference room of the Department of Civil Service, 101 Pauahi Street, Suite 2, Hilo, Hawaii, on Tuesday, July 29, 2003.

Present:

Ms. Jeanne Yagi, Chairperson
Ms. Diana Kahler, Vice Chairperson
Mr. Clarence Souza, Member
Mr. Dudley Akama, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Ms. Velma Menezes, Secretary-Reporter

Chairperson Yagi called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A) Performance Evaluation Procedures for Annual Evaluation of Director of Personnel.

The Commission reviewed evaluation factors and documents from various sources, including Water, Kauai County, Fire, and Police, as well as the position description for the Director of Personnel.

The Commission discussed the evaluation of “meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations.” It was noted that the Commission can use any kind of instrument in order to arrive at the “meet” and “doesn’t meet.”

The Commission also discussed talking to other parties the director works with for input in the evaluation process.

Chairperson Yagi reminded the Commission of the need to work with the director in establishing the performance criteria, because the director is the person who is best able to say what fits or what doesn't fit. The director does have to be involved in that process. The Commission also needs to reference the organizational/departmental goals.

Mr. Souza suggested that the Commission request any information relating to the evaluation of the director.

Mr. Akama reported on what the Fire Commission did. They don't micro-manage, and they're a pretty active commission. They talked to people at all three levels where the Chief had contact--outside of his department, within the cabinet, and within his department.

Mr. Souza commented that the Commissioners should evaluate individually, then send the evaluation to the Chairperson, who would compile all the information. The Commission should then meet to discuss the evaluation and determine what its recommendations or action would be.

Mr. Akama suggested that after the Commission completes a draft, they can get the director's input on whether he thinks the factors are valid or not.

The Commission considered sending out confidential surveys where signatures are optional as opposed to interviewing people. For those who want to give oral input, the Commission would determine whether it wants to do it in an executive session.

Mr. Akama advised that the Commission not solicit comments from anyone in an open meeting for the purpose of the evaluation. Once the Commission has decided on the evaluation criteria and procedure, then it should be at an open meeting. Any input from the public, whether by confidential

survey or oral interviews, should be done before the Commission decides on how to evaluate the director in particular areas.

Vice Chairperson Kahler noted that the Commission should go into an executive session to discuss the results with the director.

Chairperson Yagi suggested a “take-temperature type of instrument” with colleagues in the State and the County, the administration, cabinet and Council, as well as other counties, and perhaps the unions.

Mr. Souza did not agree that the unions should be consulted.

Mr. Akama reported that the Fire Commission went out to the different stations on an ongoing basis to speak to personnel and get feedback on how the Chief was doing. The matter was also agendized for every meeting from the time they formulated the procedures until they did the evaluation. The item “evaluation of the Fire Chief” was put on the agenda for three months so anyone who wanted to testify could do so. As far as any lateral evaluation with cabinet members and the Mayor, no one really spoke to that. There were outside people who came in. As far as procedure, they had a 1-5 scale, which they compiled to give the Chief the evaluation. The Chief had been on the job for a year, and it took them that long to formulate their guidelines for the evaluation.

Chairperson Yagi and Vice Chairperson Kahler agreed that a written instrument to use as a measurement would be good so that they have some standard.

The Commission developed “Procedures for Performance Evaluation of the Director of Personnel.” See attached.

The Commission requested that the department’s program goals and annual report be mailed to them.

The Commission liked Water's evaluation factors. The Commission requested that it be redone on individual sheets with more space for comments. The identification of the rater should be optional. A rating of 1 or 2 should be explained. The Commission will use the improved form for input from other parties as well.

Chairperson Yagi stated that she will draft a cover letter stating that the Civil Service Commission is initiating an interview process that is part of its rules. In order to develop appropriate instruments and strategies the Commission is asking for input on the following form. Please return it by "X" date so that the Commission can complete the process. After completing the form, return it in the enclosed, stamped envelope. Please note whether you would like to provide further input to the Commission in an executive session.

The letter could also include a request to note whether the party wishes to have someone contact him/her for more information, as well as the deadlines to meet with the Commission.

The forms will be mailed to Chairperson Yagi's home address.

The Commission requested that Mr. Akama draft the part on confidentiality.

The form will be distributed with the letter after the Commission approves the form. Ms. Menezes will prepare a tentative distribution list of the jurisdictions, related State and county agencies, the Hawaii County administration and Council.

The Commission will further discuss whether unions should be included in the list.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:530 a.m.

Submitted by,

Secretary, Civil Service Commission

APPROVED:

**Jeanne E. Yagi
Chairperson**

vym