

To: Board of Supervisors

From: David Twa, County Administrator

Date: July 24, 2012



**Contra
Costa
County**

Subject: Response to Grand Jury Report No. 1216, Entitled "Operational Effectiveness"

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE response to Civil Grand Jury Report No. 1216, entitled "Operational Effectiveness" in substantially the form set forth below, and DIRECT the Clerk of the Board to forward response to the Superior Court by August 11, 2012.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

On June 11, 2012, the 2011/12 Civil Grand Jury filed the above-referenced report, which was reviewed by the Board of Supervisors and subsequently referred to the County Administrator who prepared the response set forth below that clearly specifies:

A. Whether a finding or recommendation is accepted or will be implemented;

APPROVE

OTHER

RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **07/24/2012**

APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYES

NOES

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: July 24, 2012

To: Board of Supervisors

**From: David Twa, County
Administrator**

Date: July 24, 2012



**Contra
Costa
County**

Subject: Response to Grand Jury Report No. 1216, Entitled "Operational Effectiveness"

ABSENT ABSTAIN

RECUSE

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

**Contact: Lisa Driscoll, County
Finance Director (925) 335-1023**

cc: Ted Cwiek, Human Resources Director

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

- › If a recommendation is accepted, a statement as to who will be responsible for implementation and by what definite target date;
- › A delineation of the constraints if a recommendation is accepted but cannot be implemented within a six-month period; and
- › The reason for not accepting or adopting a finding or recommendation.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESPONSE TO CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT NO. 1216: Operational Effectiveness

FINDINGS

1. The County's mission statement provides a foundation upon which the County can begin to build a performance management process.

Response: Agree that the County's mission statement has provided a foundation upon which the County has begun to build a performance management process.

2. Many of the department goals stated in the County's budget document do not contain measurement metrics needed to establish clarity of purpose and measurability of progress.

Response: Partially disagree. Many of the department goals stated in the County's budget document do not contain measurement metrics. However many of these goals, such as the District Attorney's goal to continue efforts with other County justice partners towards design and implementation of a new case management information system, do provide clarity of purpose.

3. Performance management is now a recognized "best practice" in the public sector that can be applied in the County.

Response: Agree.

4. There are numerous reports the County could review that describe possible ways to develop and implement a framework for performance management.

Response: Agree.

5. No one has taken overall responsibility for implementing a performance management process in the County.

Response: Disagree. As described by the Grand Jury, the County Administrator has taken overall responsibility for implementing a performance management process in the County, the results of which are published annually in the County Budget document.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2011-2012 Contra Costa County Grand Jury recommends that the BOS do the following:

1. The County should review information available regarding the development and implementation of a standard framework for performance management.

Response: This recommendation has been implemented. The County routinely reviews information available regarding development and implementation of best practices including those related to performance management. Contra Costa County is a founding member of the Bay Area Regional Benchmarking Project which includes nine Bay Area counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo,

Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma. As part of this group, County Administrator staff participates in evaluating performance, improving management practices, and goal-setting. This review includes significant time reading and evaluating published performance management practices. Additionally, the County Administrator and staff have reviewed the documents recommended in Grand Jury Report No. 1216.

2. The County should adopt and implement a formalized, uniform performance management process, and identify funds to carry out this activity.

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. Due to the size of the County and the complexity of developing a formalized, uniform performance management process, the County will not adopt such a program. Instead, as described in the FY 2012-13 Recommended Budget, the County will continue to include Performance Measurement in its long-term planning strategy and participate fully in the Bay Area Regional Benchmarking Project.

3. The County should assign clear responsibility for managing and monitoring development and implementation of a performance management process.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented. The County Administrator is responsible for managing and monitoring the county's performance management process.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

None.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.