

2003-2004 SANTA CLARA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

MEASUREMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL AND PERSONNEL PERFORMANCE IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Summary

The Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) initiated an inquiry into the measurement and management of departmental and personnel performance within the governmental operations of Santa Clara County (County). The inquiry revealed a steady movement in a positive direction. The County budget is now performance based, showing departmental purpose and measures. Eighty-four percent (84%) of the current 14,840 employees will be evaluated for performance in 2004 as a result of current contract negotiations.

Background and Discussion

Eleven years ago, the grand jury of 1992-93 had found that the County government needed to establish a formal policy wherein group and individual goal setting and performance appraisal were made basic to the delivery of superior services at reasonable cost. They found a long-standing situation where seventy percent (70%) of the County employees had no written performance appraisals because they had been discontinued about eighteen years prior in union bargaining.

During recent tours and discussions with County departments, the current Grand Jury learned that performance-based measurements and reviews were still not routinely conducted for all classes of employees. Some County workers from the Service Employees International Union (Local 715) were exempted by contract, including four of the five departments in the Social Services Agency. However, all newly hired Local 715 employees, effective March 2003, are required to participate in the performance evaluation program.

The Grand Jury decided to explore the pervasiveness of performance measurement and management systems in use today by County operational departments. Are there standards? What are some of the typical measurements used? Are they based on *benchmarks*? Which are the *benchmark* organizations? What classifications of employees have performance measures? Do union contracts limit performance measures and, if so, how much?

Performance Management

The Grand Jury learned that the County has been gradually incorporating performance measurements into its department budgets for the past three years, following a two-year pilot program. All departments listed in the 2004 Budget have incorporated *Public Purpose* (Mission Statement), and *Desired Results* (Performance Measures). Some measures were still being studied for appropriateness; data had not yet been collected for some measures, and data had been collected for others, but for an insufficient period to set *Goals*. However, many of the departmental measures in use were very appropriate to organizations such as the Office of the County Assessor (e.g. percent of assessments completed by July 1 and average number of days for appeals to be closed) and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors (e.g. percent of times that timelines were met for Committee and Board of Supervisor minutes).

The Grand Jury learned that the County is typically benchmarked against other large California counties such as Alameda, San Diego, and San Bernardino, as well as some counties in Florida.

Employee Performance Evaluations

The County Labor Relations Department (Labor Relations) negotiates with 24 bargaining units representing County employees. Each of the labor organizations/bargaining units has been steadily moving toward contractual acceptance of the use of performance evaluations for all employees as detailed in the tables of Appendix A. Training for conducting performance evaluations is developed by Labor Relations in conjunction with the unions and the County Personnel Department (Personnel). Personnel established a monitoring system to implement appraisals within the County departments and ensure that evaluations are conducted according to the appropriate contract.

The County's long-range goal is to improve employee performance and facilitate the acquisition of new skills. Current contracts between the County and the unions determine promotions and salary increases; however, the County is responsible for employee discipline. The performance appraisal history of two of the largest organizations follows:

CEMA

County Employees Management Association (CEMA) personnel adopted an initial agreement for management appraisals in June 1990. In 2000, CEMA and County management revisited the appraisal process. A new process was piloted in 2002 for the Assessor's Office, Office of Labor Relations, Mental Health, Public Health, Social Services and the Recorder's Office, which included career development as an integral part of the process. A revised performance appraisal was implemented for all 1,578 members of CEMA in 2003.

LOCAL 715

During 1996–1999 contract negotiations, an agreement was made to form a joint labor-management committee to create a pilot performance appraisal program in three organizations. In the 1999 contract negotiations, the parties agreed to continue the pilot program. They also agreed to form a joint advisory committee to develop and monitor a performance appraisal program to include seventy-five percent of all Local 715 represented employees. The evaluations began in 2004 and included a review of goals three times a year with each employee. As noted in the Appendix, 5,504 of the 7,338 members in Local 715 currently receive performance evaluations. The organization consists of five bargaining units including Administrative, Professional and Technical, Clerical, Blue Collar, Public Health Nursing, and Environmental Health.

Observations and Conclusions

The County is moving steadily forward in evaluating departmental performance based on measurements against their stated goals. Eighty-four percent (84%) of County employees are currently included in performance evaluations.

Industry has used performance measures and evaluations to make great strides in productivity. The County should expect similar results by maintaining the momentum towards effective departmental measures and performance evaluations for all employees, especially in difficult financial times.

PASSED and **ADOPTED** by the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury on this 25th day of May 2004.

Richard H. Woodward
Foreperson

References

Documents

“Employee Performance Evaluations by Labor Organization/Bargaining Unit” (Appendix A).

Fiscal Year 2004 Recommended Budget (Performance Based) for Santa Clara County.

Interviews

Deputy County Executive for the Office of Budget and Analysis on October 20, 2003.

Deputy County Executive for the Employee Services Agency on November 24, 2003.

APPENDIX A

Employee Performance Evaluations by Labor Organization/Bargaining Unit

| Organization | Bargaining Unit Name | Approximate # of Filled Positions | Notes | Est # of Employees w/ Performance Evaluation Provisions |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| SEIU Local 715 | Administrative, Professional & Technical Unit | 3,541 | Minimum of 75% of Local 715 represented classifications are to be included in performance evaluations. In APT, Clerical and Blue Collar units, this number fluctuates due to the required performance evaluations at Valley Medical Center. | <i>see notes</i> |
| | Clerical Unit | 2,726 | | <i>see notes</i> |
| 5 Bargaining Units | Blue Collar Unit | 894 | | <i>see notes</i> |
| | Public Health Nursing Unit | 122 | | 122 |
| | Environmental Health Unit | 55 | | 55 |
| | Total: | 7,338 | | 5,504 |
| SEIU Local 535 – Social Services Union | Social Workers | 1,128 | Performance evaluations required by labor contract. | 1,128 |
| | Social Work Supervisors | 197 | | 197 |
| | Total: | 1,325 | | 1,325 |
| County Employees Management Association (CEMA) | Supervisory/Administrative Unit | 1,578 | Performance evaluations required by labor contract. | 1,578 |

APPENDIX A

Employee Performance Evaluations by Labor Organization/Bargaining Unit

| Organization | Bargaining Unit Name | Approximate # of Filled Positions | Notes | Est # of Employees w/ Performance Evaluation Provisions |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Registered Nurses Professional Association (RNPA) | Registered Nurses Unit | 1,163 | Nurse evaluations required under hospital licensing requirements. | 1,163 |
| Correctional Peace Officers' Association (CPOA) | Correctional Officers Unit | | | |
| | <i>Includes Correctional Officers, Sergeants, Lieutenants</i> | 757 | Performance evaluations required by labor contract. | 757 |
| Deputy Sheriffs' Association (DSA) 2 Units | Deputy Sheriff Unit | | Performance evaluations required by labor contract. | |
| | <i>Deputy Sheriff/Sergeants</i> | 483 | | 483 |
| | Supervisory Unit | | | |
| | <i>Lieutenant</i> | 14 | | 14 |
| | Total: | 497 | | 497 |
| AFSCME Local 1587 – Probation Peace Officer's Union | Probation Services Unit | 483 | Performance evaluations required by labor contract. | 483 |
| Administrative Confidential Employees (ACE) 2 Units | Confidential Clerical | 170 | Clerical staff at hospital are evaluated. | 24 |
| | Confidential Administrative | 134 | Administrative follows CEMA evaluation process. | 134 |
| | Total: | 304 | | 158 |

Prepared by the Office of Labor Relations

APPENDIX A

Employee Performance Evaluations by Labor Organization/Bargaining Unit

| Organization | Bargaining Unit Name | Approximate # of Filled Positions | Notes | Est # of Employees w/ Performance Evaluation Provisions |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Government Attorneys Association (GAA) | Professional Attorneys Unit | 318 | Performance evaluations being conducted in Public Defender's Office, not in District Attorney's Office. | 107 |
| House Staff Association (HSA) | Hospital Physicians Unit | 96 | Evaluations required under licensing requirements. | 96 |
| Engineers & Scientists of California (ESC) | Clinical Laboratory Technicians Unit | 102 | Evaluations required under hospital licensing requirements. | 102 |
| Building Trades Council (BTC) | Building Trades Unit | 122 | Employees at hospital evaluated under hospital licensing requirements. | 26 |
| Engineers & Architects' Association (E&A) | Professional Engineers Unit | 77 | Performance evaluations required by labor contract. | 77 |
| District Attorney Investigators' Association (DAIA) | District Attorney Investigators Unit | 104 | No contract language for performance evaluations. | 0 |
| Union of American Physicians & Dentists (UAPD) | Professional Physicians Unit | 49 | No contract language; SCVHHS psychiatrists at Custody facilities are evaluated annually. | 25 |

Prepared by the Office of Labor Relations

APPENDIX A

Employee Performance Evaluations by Labor Organization/Bargaining Unit

| Organization | Bargaining Unit Name | Approximate # of Filled Positions | Notes | Est # of Employees w/ Performance Evaluation Provisions |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| County Counsel Attorneys Association (CCAA) | County Counsel Attorneys Unit | 59 | Annual performance evaluations. | 59 |
| Park Rangers Association | Park Rangers Unit | 49 | Performance evaluation required under labor contract. | 49 |
| No Defined Organization 2 Units | Executive Management | 168 | Annual performance evaluations for executive management. | 168 |
| | Physicians & Surgeons | 251 | Evaluations for physicians required by hospital licensing requirements. | 251 |
| | <i>Total:</i> | 419 | | 419 |
| | | 14,840 | GRAND TOTALS | 12,425 |
| | | | | 84% |