

**MONTGOMERY-OTSEGO-SCHOHARIE
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY**

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: November 2, 2006

Location: Howes Cave Administrative Complex

Members Present:

Edward Wesnofske
Meredith McNeil
Martha Clarvoe
Joan Bent

Members Absent:

Others Present:

Gilbert L. Chichester
Rudolph Laguna

1. Opening

Chairman Wesnofske called the meeting to order at 12:55 p.m.

2. Minutes

Mr. McNeil moved to accept the minutes of the October 5, 2006 meeting of the Personnel Committee. Martha Clarvoe seconded the motion. All members agreed.

3. Equipment Maintenance Position

Mr. Chichester indicated that he and the Director of Operations and Safety would be working to develop specifications for an equipment maintenance position given the loss of Bud Ingraham. The title developed for Mr. Ingraham was specific to his background and abilities. The committee indicated that such changes should be brought before the Governing Board at its next meeting on November 16th.

4. Performance Program for Executive Director

It was acknowledged that the Governing Board has established the criteria to be used in administering the Executive Director Performance Program. Mr. Wesnofske indicated that there were a number of ways to proceed to implement the program.

Governing Board members could respond to each point by using a "S" for satisfactory or a "U" for unsatisfactory. Another method of indicating progress would be to use "N" for needs improvement, "S" for satisfactory, "G" for good, or "E" for Excellent. Each ranking could be given a numeric weight and an average be determined to indicate overall performance.

Still another approach could be for each evaluator to give a qualitative estimation of performance on the evaluation form. This then could be used to get a consensus of the Governing Board as to how performance illustrated compliance with the criteria, which could then be reinforced by situational illustration as observed by Board members. This method would be non-numeric and more descriptive.

The Chairman asked for comments and further discussion.

**Personnel Committee Meeting
November 2, 2006**

Joan Bent indicated that the narrative approach could become long and cumbersome. She felt that an approach that allowed for a numerical response would likely get a bigger response. She indicated that she might be able to get documents used for evaluating top management from another public entity. In that situation, a third party was responsible for the distribution and collection of the evaluation forms.

Mr. Wesnofske indicated that past attempts to do an evaluation were not well organized and the response was not very high. In one case, the results were not shared with the full Board and no written report was ever produced.

Ms. Bent felt it was imperative to follow the process through to conclusion.

The committee agreed with the suggestion made by Mr. Wesnofske that Robin Loske could be assigned the task to send the forms to all Governing Board members and being sure that everyone returned a response. The returned envelopes would then be forward to the Personnel Committee Chair for review with the entire Board.

Mr. Wesnofske then spoke to the need to tie the evaluation process to compensation. He felt there should be ways to give recognition for work done above and beyond.

Mr. McNeil indicated that the system that had been discussed was the most elaborate process to date. He felt it will be a living document in that it is "Work in Progress" and may well be further refined based upon use.

He felt that no more than three or four categories should be used with space provided for comment. His suggestion was to give a category for an evaluator to indicate that he/she is "Unable to Evaluate" and then rank performance with "Needs Improvement", "Meets Expectations", and "Exceeds Expectations".

Mr. Wesnofske asked if a final summary opinion of performance should be included as per the last page of the "Program" approved by the Board. The general consensus was that there should be an overall rating.

Ms. Bent indicated that in her experience there had also been a self-evaluation and a 360 degree approach with feedback coming from other levels of the organization and perhaps from parties outside the organization.

Mr. Wesnofske indicated that he had strong feelings against such an approach based upon his past experiences. He felt that the evaluation process should be implemented as discussed, the Executive Director be given the opportunity to respond and the process move to the development of an employment contract.

It was recognized that performance might depend upon the Board providing the necessary resources. Thus pressure is put upon the Governing Board to provide necessary and appropriate support to the Executive Director.

Personnel Committee Meeting
November 2, 2006

Mr. Wesnofske indicated that he would finalize a form and send it to Robin Loske with a letter of direction for implementation.

5. Employment Contract

Mr. Wesnofske indicated that he was working to develop the concepts regarding benefits to be provided through an employment contract. He will report more at a subsequent meeting.

6. Adjournment

Mr. McNeil moved to adjourn with Joan Bent seconding the motion. All were in favor.

Respectfully Submitted;

Gilbert L. Chichester
Executive Director