



[Click Here To Close This Window](#)

Economy & Efficiency Commission Meeting Minutes

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1995
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 West Temple St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Editorial Note: Agenda sections may be taken out of order at the discretion of the chair. Any reordering of sections is reflected in the presentation of these minutes.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Gunther Buerk called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

II. ATTENDANCE

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Fred Balderrama
Gunther Buerk
John Crowley
David Farrar
John FitzRandolph
Louise Frankel
Jon Fuhrman
Jaclyn Tilley Hill
Chun Lee
Roman Padilla
William Petak
Randy Stockwell
Julia Sylva
Betty Trotter

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED

Richard Barger
Carole Ojeda Kimbrough
Tony Tortorice
H. Randall Stoke

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Albert Vera

Commissioner Crowley inquired as to what qualified as an excused absence. Mr. Staniforth replied that upon notification that a Commissioner would not be able to attend, he or she would normally be granted an excused absence by the Commission. Although often volunteered, staff does not ask for a reason for the absence.

Chairperson Buerk stated that, in the future, the Commissioners will be required to give reasons for their absences.

Moved, Seconded, and Approved: The Commission members noted above be excused.

III. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Chairperson Buerk asked for any amendments, corrections or objections to the proposed Minutes from the April 1995 Commission meeting.

Commissioner Crowley indicated that on the top of page seven his comments should include the language "such as municipal services to incorporated cities."

Moved, Seconded and Approved: The minutes of the April 5, 1995 Commission Meeting be approved as amended.

Chairperson Buerk asked for any amendments, corrections or objections to the proposed Minutes from the March 1995 Commission meeting.

Moved, Seconded and Approved: The minutes of the March 1, 1995 Commission Meeting be approved as amended.

IV. INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Staniforth introduced Lt. Nottingham from the Sheriff's Department who was attending the meeting to get an update on Risk Management. Lt. Nottingham introduced his colleagues, Lt. Aiding and Sgt. Lyle, who were also present.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Real Property Management.

Task Force Chairperson Farrar reported that since the last meeting he had met with the Executive Committee. At that meeting he recommended and they approved the retention of a consultant to assist the Task Force in analysis of all office leases over 20,000 sq. ft.. The purpose of this study would be: a) to determine the rental variance, if any, from comparable office space in the immediate vicinity and b) to develop, with respect to all leases which reflect a significant variance, a recommendation of which steps could be taken to renegotiate the lease to current market level.

Mr. Staniforth and Commissioner Farrar have been coordinating the proper paperwork to submit for authorization to use an amount not to exceed \$20,000 to secure a consultant on this project prior to the end of the fiscal year. The Task Force will meet to discuss specific qualifications. Commissioner Farrar has also recommended that, in the near future, Dan Rosenfeld be scheduled as a speaker for the Commission. Mr. Rosenfeld has spent the last two years doing a similar study for the State of California. He is currently undertaking a similar study for the city of Los Angeles.

Chairperson Buerk asked Commissioner Farrar to give an update on the coordination with the Quality and Productivity Commission. Commissioner Farrar replied that he received a message from Mr. Waddell. He had also left a voice mail message with Ms. Sarah Stivelman on what this Task Force was attempting to do. Ms. Stivelman spoke with Mr. Staniforth and referred the Task Force to the CAO's office.

Commissioner Crowley stated that the parameters of the project appeared to be specifically focused and he asked if the project would explore any other related areas. Commissioner Farrar replied that the reason the project is so focused is a result of the limited funds available to undertake this assignment. This study will also serve as a survey which may possibly indicate areas of further exploration. The E&E Commission would like to make its contribution by standing back and taking a look at the entire picture and offering suggestions for a long term plan.

Commissioner Crowley felt that the language of the charge would discourage the consultant from exploring other areas of concern. Commissioner Farrar replied that it is his intention to have a Task Force meeting to expand and confirm the areas of the consultant's focus. The primary reason for the consultant is to assist the Task Force in the scope of their report.

Commissioner Sylva commented that the County issues several real estate lease backed bonds, the real estate serving as a security for these bonds. Is this report going to explore this area? Commissioner Farrar replied that the first effort of the Task Force is to examine real estate leased by the County and owned by others. Currently rents for office space are low. This report will review how much we are paying and if we should renegotiate our leases.

Commissioner Crowley asked if we are considering the solution of relocating to low cost land. Commissioner Farrar replied that we are focusing on leases that are currently not up for renewal, where lease costs might be reduced.

Commissioner Stockwell commented that, several years ago, the E&E Commission completed a report on the global issue of real estate which suggested that the County try to elevate the notion of occupancy costs to a higher level in the management structure. Now is a good time to focus narrowly on leases that may be over market.

B. Liability and Risk Management.

Task Force Chairperson Lee reported that the Task Force met on April 27, 1995 and discussed the approval of the draft which they presented to the Commission today. He mentioned that Commissioner Padilla had expressed some concerns regarding the draft.

Commissioner Padilla thanked the Task Force for their efforts on the report and then he directed the Commission's attention to page 26 where he suggested adding to the phrase in the discussion, "the evaluation made by the County with regard to contract for performance and cost audit of outside legal defense counsel." He commented that in the previous report, the Commission recommended that the County consider auditing outside defense firms. Subsequently, there was an RFP issued by the Auditor- Controller. This RFP included the stipulation that the auditor would have to prove in a court of law any wrong doing by the legal defense counsel. This stipulation increased the workload for the auditor in order to conduct the audit, along with the overall cost of the audit. The original recommendation was to audit firms that were billing in excess of \$3 million annually to the County. The County dropped the idea because it was too expensive to conduct the audit. Commissioner Padilla wanted to insure that the County continued to have the opportunity to audit these firms. He proposed to amend the report so the County could audit these firms if they thought it was appropriate.

Chairperson Buerk stated that the County currently has the option of auditing any outside contractor. Commissioner Padilla replied that the language in the report states, "We concur the County's decision, not to proceed with an outside audit of legal defense firms with the largest billings to the County."

Motion to: 1) Delete the language, "We concur the County's decision, not to proceed with an outside audit of legal defense firms with the largest billings to the County," on page 26 2) Delete the wording "explore the possibility or" and change "engaging" to "engage" on page 27, Recommendation 10. 3) Add the wording, "Direct the Auditor-Controller to authorize the audit of outside firms that have billed the County for over \$3 million annually." Motion seconded.

Chairperson Buerk asked if there were any questions regarding this motion. Commissioner Petak replied that if the motion stands then the paragraph that follows needs to be changed as well. Commissioner Padilla concurred and asked that the motion include deleting the first sentence of the paragraph that follows Recommendation 10 and add to the second sentence "and audits" after the word training.

Commissioner Petak asked the Task Force to discuss its reasoning behind supporting the County's position. Commissioner Lee commented that it did not appear to the Task Force to be cost effective to conduct this type of audit. Chairperson Buerk replied that it is difficult to anticipate the actual savings of an audit. Mr. Staniforth replied that this recommendation comes from the consultants who have been involved in a number of audits. Commissioner Padilla amended his motion to include "as feasible" in relation to audits. This would leave the auditor with the discretion of whether to conduct an audit.

Commissioner Petak asked why the figure of \$3 million was chosen. Commissioner Padilla replied that particular figure was recommended as a threshold in a previous report. Commissioner Petak replied that with language "as feasible" there is no need for a set ceiling of three million dollars. Chairperson Buerk concurred. Commissioner Padilla amended the motion to remove "for over \$3 million annually."

Mr. Staniforth stated that modification would now become another recommendation (Recommendation 11) to target audits. Commissioner Sylva concurred. Chairperson Buerk stated that the motion should include language to direct the staff to incorporate this information in a new recommendation.

Chairperson Buerk directed staff and Commissioner Padilla to develop specific language for the motion. The Commission decided to move on and defer the motion until this language is prepared later in the meeting.

C. Department of Health Services-Reengineering.

In Task Force Chairperson Tortorice's absence Commissioner Frankel reported that they had a Task Force meeting last Thursday. They have had an opportunity to read the consultant's draft report and although Commissioner Frankel found the organization of the report easy to follow, she felt it could become more aggressive in its analysis. Mr. Staniforth will do additional work with the consultants to take a harder look at how to improve the report.

Chairperson Buerk asked if there was an estimate of savings. Commissioner Frankel replied that savings required further clarification. She felt that information in this area could be improved, along with constructive analysis.

Commissioner Petak asked if the Task Force and consultant were looking for improved effectiveness in the level of service or dollar savings. Commissioner Frankel replied both. A more efficient use of the personnel and work space, would cut down on the time the patients had to spend in the facility. As an example, one of the points in the report stated that several persons coming through the emergency room did not require emergency services, but rather needed to see a primary care physician or should be treated at a clinic. The Task Force is planning a tour of these health care facilities. She feels it will be valuable to personally review these facilities.

Mr. Staniforth commented that it is not uncommon for a consultant to "test the waters" with a first draft to see what direction a client wants to go. Now is an appropriate time to provide additional direction to the consultant.

Commissioner Petak commented that as he understood it, this was a test effort for the process of reengineering and because of that, a small area was chosen to be reengineered. In a presentation that was made to the Commission regarding this area, the speaker talked about the reengineering process which entails finding out what needs to be done and persuading the individuals on the staff to implement these changes. We need to keep in mind that the consultant needs to understand the process of the hospital's current system in order to make recommendations for reengineering.

Commissioner Frankel commented that the consultant could consolidate some of the processes involving the patient, but she still felt that additional substance was required.

Chairperson Buerk suggested at the next Task Force meeting that a representative from the consultant's firm be present.

D. Unincorporated Area Services.

Task Force Chairperson Padilla reported that progress is being made on the report and he has two models that help define the issues that will be explored in the report: 1) a revenue and expenditure model, and 2) county services delivery model. A draft report is planned for the Task Force in a few weeks.

Commissioner Crowley stated that the graphics in the model did not represent what was in the draft report. Commissioner Padilla replied that these models were essentially the same as presented earlier and that they will be accompanied by supporting text when the report is completed.

E. Jury Management.

Task Force Chairperson Trotter reported that efforts of the Commission's study to improve the treatment of jurors have been obscured by the events taking place in the Simpson trial. She has been attempting to stir up interest in the report by talking to Pat Morrison of Life and Times (KCET) and is sending her a copy of the report for possible consideration for discussion on the program. She is also sending a copy to Warren Olney of Which Way LA

Commissioner Crowley asked if there had been a consultant working on this report. Task Force Chairperson Trotter replied that the report had been done with the assistance of former staff member Charlie Kaufmann, who is now deceased.

Chairperson Buerk asked Mr. Staniforth if he had any information regarding the court recommendations. Mr. Staniforth replied that it has been assigned to the Grand and Trial Jury Committee of the Superior Court. An option available to the Commission would be to send a letter requesting clarification to Judge Klauser. Chairperson Buerk replied that would be a good idea and directed staff to prepare a draft for his signature.

F. Natural History Museum.

Task Force Chairperson Trotter reported that the report has been published and distributed.

Commissioner Petak stated that his name should read "William" on the report cover and not "Bill." Mr. Staniforth stated that would be corrected on all future reports.

Mr. Staniforth stated that the Association of Systematics Collections, a lobby group for museums based in Washington, has asked for reports for their board of directors and to distribute to member museums.

Chairperson Buerk inquired as to the status of the Board's consideration of the recommendations made in this report. Mr. Staniforth replied that it has been distributed to the Board. With Commission direction it will be filed as a Board letter. Chairperson Buerk replied that he would like to have the report filed as a Board letter as soon as possible.

Commissioner Fuhrman stated that his name and Commissioner Tortorice's name were also misspelled on the cover of the report. Mr. Staniforth replied that they would be corrected on all future reports.

G. County Economic Growth.

Task Force Chairperson Philibosian reported that there has been no further action since the last meeting. If there is to be action meetings with the Supervisors will have to be scheduled.

Chairperson Buerk asked if there was any movement on any of the recommended legislation. Task Force Chairperson Philibosian replied that there was no movement. Chairperson Buerk asked if there was anything the Commission needed to do in order to facilitate action. Task Force Chairperson Philibosian replied that he needed to check with the Democratic and Republican caucus people over the next couple of weeks and determine what direction the bills appear to be moving. At that time the Commission can approach the Supervisors.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Frankel gave an update on the Security Task Force. She read a memo from Lt. Lee Taylor, Office of Security Management, Chief Administrative Office, on the subject of building security coordinators:

"In July 1991 the County Building Security Program was initiated. Each facility identified an on-site person who became responsible for security issues within that facility. The Office of Security Management (OSM) provided training to teach building security coordinators how to conduct the Security Preparedness Audit for their facility. The Security Preparedness Audit is an on-site examination of the building to determine security measures presently enforced, practices that need changing, or procedures that should be implemented to bring the facility up to appropriate standards. The audit is due each year on June 1 to OSM and they are kept on file.

"The Security Incident Report is another component of the County Security Program. OSM gathers statistical information from reports sent to us by facility coordinators. OSM publishes a security incident report every three months that details incidents by facility and type for each County Department. From these figures the Department Heads can determine the trends or problem areas that need attention.

"Several changes have occurred within the County since the program began, including the staff at OSM. It is time to revisit these programs to assure a sound and secure Los Angeles County. Currently, Sgt. Karen Green is managing the ISR Program and the security audits. Attached is the current listing of building security coordinators for your department, please distribute them to your facilities for necessary corrections and return."

She felt it would be interesting to have the lieutenant make a presentation to the Commission on security in light of the Oklahoma City bombing.

Liability and Risk Management. (Return to previously tabled issue)

Chairperson Buerk thanked Commissioner Frankel for her update and asked if staff and Commissioner Padilla were ready to share the wording for the new recommendation to the entire Commission. Mr. Staniforth stated that on page 26, second paragraph from the bottom, last sentence, which reads, "We concur with the County's decision not to proceed with an outside audit of legal defense firms with the largest billing to the County," will be deleted. On page 27, Recommendation 10, delete "explore the possibility of," and change "engaging" to "engage". The Auditor-Controller requested to be deleted from that listing as well. Delete the sentence, "It appears that a comprehensive audit of the outside defense firms is too expensive at the present time." Add Recommendation 11, "The Auditor-Controller, as determined to be economically feasible, should retain the services of an independent consultant to perform audits of legal defense firms."

Mr. Staniforth reminded the Commission that although the report may still undergo formatting or sentence structure changes, there will be no substantive changes.

Motion to adopt Risk Management and Liability Cost Study - Follow Up Report as amended. Motion seconded and passed with no objections.

Chairperson Buerk gave an update on the Executive Committee meeting. At the last Commission meeting, it was determined that the Executive Committee examine the need for the MIS project and the possibility of a consultant for

the Real Asset Management Task Force. The Executive Committee found that MIS project had become obsolete, especially in light of the possible elimination of the Internal Services Department. The project may be revisited at a later date. The Executive Committee also agreed that the Real Asset Management Task Force was in need of a consultant to assist with their project.

Commissioner Hill raised a concern she had with the way the Commission handles the process of comments on final draft reports presented by Task Forces. Although she appreciates the Commissioners who take time to thoroughly consider the report and make suggestions, she feels that presenting the comments at the Commission meeting when the report is to be approved, is unfair to the Task Force. This approach does not allow the Task Force time to adequately present their rationale. In addition, it occupies inordinate time at the Commission meeting.

A proposed solution would be for the Task Force to receive the comments of individual Commissioners through the staff giving them an opportunity to consider them as a Task Force. Commissioners need to be aware that when one item is changed, it may have repercussions throughout the entire report. She stated that she has raised this issue of concern previously and that she would suggest a review of this process. Commissioner Philibosian concurred with Commissioner Hill and suggested the Commission add this to its procedures. He suggested that five working days before a Commission meeting, individual Commissioners must have their comments to the Task Force or staff; thus eliminating last minute surprises.

Commissioner Fuhrman said that, normally, Task Forces are trying to meet deadlines to publish reports and he questions whether or not the Task Force would be able to get the draft out early enough to receive comments back in time. Commissioner Philibosian replied that if the draft is distributed to the Commission 10 working days in advance of the Commission meeting, and the draft reports with comments are returned to the Task Force within five working days of the Commission, that gives the Task Force 5 working days to discuss and respond to any comments or suggestions made. If the Task Force totally disagrees with the individual comments then they can be brought before the entire Commission.

Chairperson Buerk agreed that this was a good idea and should become a part of the procedures. There may be a situation where a report requires immediate action and may not be able to meet these guidelines, but as a general rule, the Commission should receive a draft report 10 working days before a Commission meeting. The Task Force should receive comments back from individual Commissioners by five working days before a Commission meeting. This gives the Task Force 5 working days to consider any substantive changes.

Commissioner Fuhrman agreed with reviewing the function of monthly reviews of Commission progress. He is concerned with the lack of specificity and details of information and hopes that this new process will result in issues surfacing earlier.

Commissioner FitzRandolph questioned if this new policy would mean no more open discussions at the Commission meetings. Commissioner Buerk replied that this policy would allow the Task Force an opportunity to respond to comments and suggestions. However, if they did not agree with these suggestions, Commissioners could still present their point of views to the entire Commission.

Commissioner Stockwell pointed out that the Commission no longer receives outlines, etc. on the progress of a Task Force's report until the final draft. Why not extend the amount of comment time that the Commission has to look at a draft. Then the Commission could be presented with a draft and opposing opinions Chairperson Buerk replied that the reason outlines and other information are not going to the entire Commission sooner is due to the Brown Act, which makes any document public when it is sent to the majority of the Commission.

Commissioner Sylva commented that according to the Brown Act, in order to make this a procedure, it needs to be put on the Agenda to be voted on at the next Commission meeting.

Commissioner Trotter expressed her concern about the frequency of Commissioners withdrawing from Task Forces, which compounds the work for those who stay on the Task Force. She requested that Chairperson Buerk replace Commissioners who withdraw, so the Task Force can operate at full strength. Chairperson Buerk agreed that would be good policy, and when a Task Force member drops out, he and the Task Force Chairperson will find a replacement.

Commissioner Crowley commented that Commissioner Padilla passed out two graphics at the meeting today that he had never seen before. Commissioner Crowley is a member of that Task Force, and was curious if there was a procedure that called for some type of communication between the Task Force Chairperson and the Task Force. Chairperson Buerk encouraged all Task Force Chairpersons to provide the Task Force with all materials, before they are distributed or shown to the Commission. Commissioner Crowley felt this was important in order to give the Task Force members an opportunity to evaluate and respond to the materials.

Chairperson Buerk stated that the policy would be instituted. As mentioned earlier in the meeting, draft reports must be

sent to the Commission 10 working days in advance of the Commission meeting, Commissioners must return their individual comments and suggestions to the Task Force 5 days before the Commission meeting. Commissioner Sylva reminded him that this item must be placed on the agenda for next month in order to comply with the Brown Act. Chairperson Buerk asked that the item be placed on the agenda for the June meeting.

VII. PRESENTATION

Catherine Schuster from KH Consulting Group, introduced herself; Nancy Singer, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Panel that was responsible for studying the pay for performance plan for County Managers and Tom Marvin, with Human Resources and also serving on the Ad Hoc Panel.

Ms. Schuster explained that in the Ad Hoc Study they are examining two tiers of managers: 1) managers that report to department heads and 2) managers that report to the managers in number one. Although the outcome of the study will affect department heads, this study is not focusing on them.

Commissioner Crowley asked if the word manager included professionals. Ms. Singer stated that of 85,000 County employees, 9,000 are non-represented, 5,000 of those are considered professionals. The Performance Base Plan (PBP) for managers encompasses 1,300 of those professionals, and the new Management Appraisal Plan (MAP) is concentrated on reducing that population.

Ms. Schuster explained the process that the panel had been going through. First they reviewed the old plan to find the problems and not repeat them. This review was conducted through extensive interviews with members of the Ad Hoc Panel, Department Heads, and focus groups which included 10% of current plan participants. This provided a good sample of feedback.

Some of the problems with the old plan included: 1) It focused on individual performance which became very divisive in the County atmosphere, 2) Political interference, and 3) Individual managers and department heads lacked skills in writing goals and providing feedback.

The plan did work in the individual departments where there was strong department planning, the department mission was fully articulated, and where a management appraisal plan was incorporated into overall department planning.

Commissioner Petak commented that they needed an information system to gather data to truly measure objectives which didn't exist. Ms. Schuster replied that was one aspect of the problem. In addition, many things that people are asked to do, are difficult to quantify. This was a complaint because it has been difficult to measure differences within departments in regards to assignments, location, and departmental mission. Each of these has made a consistent approach difficult. Thus, in some instances, the plan was perceived to be unfair because it didn't accurately measure performance and was based on "stretch goals" which did not reflect the day to day basics of an individual's job duties. Many employees would set goals that had already been achieved in order to get their daily work done.

Another aspect of the plan perceived to be weak was a forced bell curve. This approach imposed a quota of employees in the categories: far exceeds, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. This is a particular problem in small departments. Ratings were also changed after the fact to support this curve approach. Managers were frustrated because their authority was being undermined. Employees were upset from having their performance evaluated by someone who wasn't aware of their responsibilities.

The last three years' salaries have been frozen, so there has been no compensation incentive. This has led to a widespread decline in morale.

Commissioner Fuhrman asked if employees viewed the system as failing or their management as failing? Ms. Schuster replied that it was fairly even, the implementation of the plan was interfered with by the former CAO and the Board of Supervisors. In addition, they rarely received the feedback they needed in their annual reviews.

Ms. Schuster commented that for the first few years the plan worked well. However, any plan should be reevaluated after five years. The first year or two the plan is learned, the next couple of years it is implemented, and by the fifth or sixth year, people are learning how to work the system.

Critical success factors include:

1. Continuous improvement of day to day duties
2. Reduced number of high priority goals
3. Flexibility to accommodate the County's many businesses
4. Support from the Board and CAO
5. Meaningful time line

6. Mid-year adjustments
7. On-going training
8. Rewards for group performance/teamwork, while still rewarding individuals
9. Multi-year goals
10. Manager rewards
11. Simplify plan administration
12. Meet the public's needs
13. Response to the Board of Supervisors is four dimensional
 - a) Fundamental Performance Expectations
 - b) Management Behaviors
 - c) Department Wide Goals
 - d) County Wide Goals

Commissioner Crowley commented that when he was a consultant 30-35 years ago, the same issues and objections were being raised. The problem is that objectives are subjectively established. Ms. Schuster agreed with him, but stated that the degree of cynicism surrounding the issues now is very high. They are trying to improve the perception of fairness.

Commissioner Crowley commented that the Board of Supervisors and Department heads need to know the best questions to ask to determine what action to take.

Chairperson Buerk asked if this study covers the elected officials in the Sheriff's Department, and are those personnel subject to the same direction that the Board gives or the Sheriff's Department. Ms. Singer replied yes they are covered and they report and abide to both the Board and the Sheriff's Department. Chairperson Buerk asked if there was conflict, who decides. Ms. Singer was not certain, but felt the Sheriff would probably decide for his own department. This would all depend on how the goals were established for that department. There must be consistency in goals, but there also needs to be flexibility between different departments.

Commissioner Frankel asked if the level of management that was being discussed was civil service. Ms. Singer replied yes, with the exception of certain positions within the elected offices.

Ms. Schuster reiterated that a major problem was that employees were not getting adequate training or meaningful feedback from their advisors. Commissioner Fuhrman commented that although the study is focusing on two levels, it seems to acknowledge that upper-level management is not performing as it should. Ms. Schuster replied yes, and she would like to see this type of training and evaluation continued through every level. Commissioner Fuhrman concurred.

Commissioner Frankel felt that the main issue appears to be supervision and responsibility to those which an individual is in charge of supervising. Ms. Schuster agreed.

Commissioner Crowley asked Ms. Schuster as to their charge. Ms. Schuster replied their charge was to design a new plan for this class of managers, taking into account the problems of the old plan. This included focusing on more meaningful goals, increased accountability, and issues of fairness. Ms. Singer added that in 1993 several managers in the performance based pay system approached the Supervisors with what they felt was the unfairness of the system. The Board directed the CAO to create an Ad Hoc Panel of managers in PBP to review the current plan to determine weaknesses and perceptions. The panel then convened, surveyed managers, and identified a list of the common problems. There were so many problems that the individual departments could not handle them. At this point the Human Resources Department suggested hiring a consultant to assist in developing a new system.

Commissioner Petak encouraged Ms. Schuster to continue with the focus on training as this will assist in enhancing understanding and buy-in. Ms. Schuster agreed this was a pivotal component as well as meaningful feedback. Commissioner Frankel agreed and cited a case that cost the County around \$7 million in back pay because an employee was not given proper feedback on the status of his performance. This happened back in the 70's when Kenny Kirkpatrick was fired by the Board of Supervisors. The decision to fire him was upheld by a review board. The case went to court and he was able to get back pay and reinstated, because for four years he was not given an evaluation and although during those four years he received no pay increase, it was determined that he had a right to expect that evaluation.

Commissioner Padilla asked how the universal goals would impact the total work environment. Ms. Schuster replied that they are attempting to get the Board to agree on 3-5 broad range County-wide goals that could be incorporated into department goals.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Buerk thanked Ms. Schuster for her presentation and wished her luck in the success of the plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Bruce J. Staniforth
Executive Director

[Go to May 3, 1995 Agenda](#)

[Return to June 7, 1995 Agenda](#)



Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 163, 500 West Temple St.,
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone (213) 974-1491 FAX (213) 620-1437 [E-Mail eecomm@co.la.ca.us](mailto:eecomm@co.la.ca.us)
WEB eec.co.la.ca.us