

OCT 22 1990

July 30, 1990  
JH:jkm t:iae

INTRODUCED BY: KENT PULLEN

PROPOSED NO. 90-646

ORDINANCE NO. **9695**

AN ORDINANCE relating to the King County Department of Adult Detention employee incentive awards program; and extending the duration of said program.

PREAMBLE:

In accordance with the provisions of K.C.C. 3.13A.050 and King County Ordinance No. 9111, authorizing the Department of Adult Detention's Employee Incentive Awards Program for a two-year period, the department was required to submit a program evaluation in June 1990. The evaluation recommended extending the program for a further two years.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. Ordinance No. 9111, Section 5, and K.C.C. 3.13A.050 is hereby amended to read as follows:

The pilot program is authorized to operate from November 1, 1987, through June 30, (~~1990~~) 1992, at which time a program evaluation will be submitted to the King County council.

INTRODUCED AND READ for the first time this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of October, 1990.

PASSED this 5<sup>th</sup> day of November, 1990.

KING COUNTY COUNCIL  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Lois North  
Chair

ATTEST:

Gerald G. Peterson  
Clerk of the Council

APPROVED this 16 day of November, 1990.

Jim Hill  
King County Executive

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT DETENTION  
EMPLOYEE INCENTIVE PROGRAM EVALUATION

JUNE 1990

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the Department of Adult Detention's (DAD) Employee Incentive Program. The program is authorized through June 30, 1990 by King County Ordinance 9111. This ordinance requires the submittal of a program evaluation to the King County Council.

The following program evaluation describes the background of DAD's Employee Incentive Program and provides a summary description of the program and its operation. Results of a staff survey are detailed, and recommendations are provided.

Background

In November 1987, the King County Executive authorized the Department of Adult Detention to begin an employee incentive awards program. Executive authorization was based on King County Code 3.13 which had previously established a merit awards program for the county (see Attachment 1). Subsequent discussions were held with the Cabinet and, in February 1988, DAD was authorized to implement the program on a trial basis pursuant to review by the Prosecuting Attorney and the State Auditor. Because the program was limited to only one County department, and because it involved remuneration to County employees, an area of Council jurisdiction, formal Council approval was sought. Following discussions with both Local 519 and AFSCME Local 21-AD, modifications to the policy were made to satisfy concerns expressed by bargaining representatives, including any concerns previously expressed in the form of grievances or unfair labor practices (see Attachment 2). Ordinance 9111 was approved in by the Council in August 1989 (see Attachment 3).

Program Description

DAD's Employee Incentive Program was created to recognize and reward employees who perform in an exemplary manner or who make significant contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the correctional/detention operations. More specific details of the program operation as provided in the departmental policies and procedures are attached (Attachment 4). In general, the program recognizes employees in the three following areas.

o Employee of the Month/Year

This award recognizes an employee who has contributed significantly to the correctional/detention process; or, has performed in all areas beyond what is required in the position description; or has made a definite impact on the orderly running of the department.

Initially, nominations for employee of the month were made by supervisors. In response to concerns expressed by the bargaining unit, the nomination process was changed to include nominations by employee colleagues as well. All nominations are routed through the chain of command. (see Attachment 2).

The screening committee was initially composed of the Personnel Officer (Chair), Associate Director, Administrative Assistant, Union Representative, and the Personnel Secretary (nonvoting member). This is the current composition of the Suggestion Committee. In response to concerns expressed by the bargaining unit, the current Employee of the Month screening committee is composed of six members as follows: two members nominated by DAD management, two uniformed staff members nominated by Local 519, two nonuniformed staff members nominated one each by Local 519 and by AFSCME Local 21-AD.

The committee meets monthly to review nominations. Nominations are carried forward for the next two months if the nominee is not selected that month. Nominations are scored by the committee members. Up to three nominations are forwarded to the Director, who makes the final selection. The selected employee receives a certificate and a check for \$250, and has their picture posted for one month (or year, if the Employee of the Year).

The procedures associated with the Employee of the Year are the same. This employee may be selected from one of the previous Employees of the Month, or may be a new selection. The Employee of the Year Award is \$500.

o Suggestion Award

This award is a one-time cash award presented in recognition of ideas which are judged to directly increase economy, efficiency, or effectiveness of departmental operations. Suggestions receive awards of \$25 - 100, depending upon the significance of the suggestion on departmental operations. Those suggestions which provide tangible savings to King County receive a small percentage (from 1 - 3%) of the annualized savings (see Attachment 2). The Director makes the final decision based on the recommendations of the Suggestion Committee.

- o Special Act Award

This award recognizes a single instance of behavior or performance which is sufficiently outstanding to warrant formal recognition. Nominations are approved by the Director. Persons selected for this award receive \$250.

#### Evaluation Methodology

A three-pronged approach was used to assess the Employee Incentive Program.

- o Descriptive materials were examined to gain an understanding of the program, its history, and its current operation. These materials included notes and minutes from the Selection Committee meetings, relevant ordinances and staff reports, policies and procedures.
- o A Staff Survey was given to each DAD employee (see Attachment 5). This survey was brief in order to encourage completion by as many staff as possible. The survey was anonymous to encourage candid replies. The survey assessed staff familiarity with the program and opinions regarding the program.
- o Interviews of DAD managers/Captains were conducted. The interviews briefly covered the same topics as the survey.

#### Results

- o A review of descriptive materials reveals that there are gaps of time in which no Employee of the Month was selected, pursuant to resolution of such issues as Prosecutor review, Council Approval and modification of policies as a result of discussions with employee bargaining units. The program appears to be on a steady track in 1990 now that these issues are resolved.
- o The Incentive Awards Committee members have been selected, the committee has met monthly, and nominations are being screened per the modified policies and procedures.
- o The records of the Incentive Award Committee were examined to assess the number of nominations which had been made from December 1989 through June 1990. A total of 18 nominations were made. Fourteen of the nominations were for correction officers, four were for civilian staff (kitchen, records, classification, administration, etc.) The number of nominations each month varies (in 1990 the number of nominations varied from two to eight each month).

- o The Employee of the Month/Year Awards which have been granted since the program's implementation in November 1987 are attached (see Attachment 6). Only 5 months of 1989 had Employees of the Month due to pending Council motions and resolution of issues raised by collective bargaining units. The award totals for each year are listed as follows.

Employee of the Month

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| 1987 (Nov/Dec)             | \$ 500 |
| 1988 (entire year)         | 3000   |
| 1989 (Jan/Feb/Mar/Nov/Dec) | 1250   |
| 1990 (Jan - May)           | 1250   |

Employee of the Year

|      |        |
|------|--------|
| 1988 | \$ 500 |
| 1989 | 500    |

- o As of March 1989, ten Suggestion Awards had been granted a total of \$300. No Suggestion Awards have been given subsequent to this date. Four suggestions made in 1989 are currently pending in the committee files.
- o Two Special Act Awards have been granted. In October 1989 a Corrections Officer was selected to receive the award based on his handling of inmate information regarding a possible escape. In January 1990, another Corrections Officer was selected due to outstanding handling of a weapons-related incident.
- o The Staff Survey results are provided in Attachment 7. Surveys were given to the department sections on the same day that paychecks were distributed in order to maximize the number of staff who would see the survey (potentially 430). Forty-four staff responded, a response rate of (10.2%). The responses indicated the following:
  1. The majority of those who responded (75%) indicated that they think the Employee of the Month/Year Program is a good idea. There were 14% who did not think so, and 11% were undecided.
  2. An even higher number of respondents (82%) indicated that they think the Employee Suggestion Program is a good idea. There were only 4% who did not think so and approximately 14% were undecided.
  3. Questions 3, 4, and 5 attempted to assess whether those who responded had been involved in the program. It appears that this is the case for many of those who responded to the survey. Almost half (43%) had nominated someone for Employee

of the Month/Year. Eighteen percent had themselves been nominated. Almost one third (30%) had made an Employee Suggestion.

4. Many of the staff who responded took the time to make thoughtful and constructive comments. Some of the positive comments included: "the program gives staff a sense of recognition/appreciation," and "administration acknowledging hard work." Others, who still thought the program was a good idea, felt that "too often the support staff is the focus" or that more administrative staff received the award despite being proportionately a smaller part of the total staff. The comments on the Employee Suggestion Program were virtually all positive, except that some staff were unfamiliar with the program.
- o The interviews of managers/Captains yielded mixed results. A total of 15 out of the 17 possible were interviewed. Others were provided with surveys. Both the managers and captains had positive and negative comments about the program.
1. Ten (67%) think that the Employee of the Month program is a good idea, four (27%) do not think so, and one (2%) is undecided. Those in favor felt that it allowed them the opportunity to recognize extra effort by staff. Those against the program felt that it had become a "popularity" contest in which those staff who were not nominated felt disgruntled.
  2. The managers and captains, except for one, agreed that the Employee Suggestion program is a good idea. Many, however, indicated that this program is not well known and needs to be promoted more.

### Conclusions

The descriptive information and the survey and interview results yield considerable information concerning the Employee Incentive Program. This program, after a staggered start, is now operating fairly smoothly. While the survey responses are based on a response rate of 10%, this number is not unusually low in a survey of this size. Those who did respond were overwhelmingly positive. It is assumed that staff who strongly dislike the program would have responded so. Perhaps the majority of staff could be viewed as "apathetic" on this issue. Ways to address this disinterest are discussed in the recommendations.

Staff at all levels had thoughtful comments on how the program could operate more smoothly and equitably. A number of these are incorporated in the recommendations.

One common concern of the staff regarding the Employee of the Month program

was that the most qualified staff were not being selected. A number of recommendations are offered below which, in addition to increasing the number of employees nominated, affect the quality of those selected.

Another concern regarding the Employee of the Month program was that the award was not distributed equally between civilians and officers. Of the eighteen nominees from December 1989 to June 1990, 4 civilians were selected and 3 corrections officers were selected as Employee of the Month. Correction Officers represent 65% (280 out of 430 staff positions) of the DAD staff. Theoretically, Corrections Officers should be selected roughly two thirds of the time. That this is in fact not the case, appears to be due to the nomination/selection process. Two of the recommendations below directly address solutions to this issue.

The most common concern regarding the Employee Suggestion Program was that it simply is not used because it is not well publicized. Recommendation six refers to this problem.

#### Recommendations

1. The Employee of the Month/Year Incentive Award program should be continued. The majority of staff at all levels who responded in interviews and through surveys appear to be in favor of this program and feel that it contributes to a better operation of the department. Many employees stated, however, that there are operational changes which would make the program more equitable. These are discussed in the following recommendations.
2. The Employee Suggestion Program should be continued. The staff was virtually unanimous in their approval of this program. A common concern expressed was that this program was not well-publicized. This concern is recognized in Recommendation 6.
3. The Special Act Award should be continued. This award is seldom exercised and thus not costly to the County, and it also is appropriate for one-time situations in which an employee deserves recognition.
4. A key factor in the success of the Employee of the Month program is the number of nominations which are available for selection. By increasing the number of nominations, not only will many employees be recognized, the proportion of civilians to corrections officers should become more evenly distributed. To increase nominations it is recommended that:
  - a request for nominations be made at each shifts' roll call at least twice per month;
  - nomination forms be placed in a readily visible area such as the roll call room, the Captains' Office, Court Services reception, etc.;

- requests for nomination should be "boxed" in each issue of the Emerald Digest;
  - a designated personnel staffperson should remind managers and captains each month to submit their nominations. Managers and captains should strive for a previously specified "quota."
5. An additional recommendation with respect to the number of nominations is that each nomination be effective for one year rather than the current three months. In this way, even though many staff are nominated, each will have a chance of selection. Currently, if five are nominated, after three months of being held over, two would be rendered ineligible (assuming three have been selected). It is recommended that this suggestion be followed retroactively in order that previous nominations can be reconsidered.
  6. A Supervisor of the Quarter award should be considered. Sergeants are currently not eligible. This award would be limited to sergeants and lead workers (rather than section supervisors).
  7. In addition to increasing the total number of nominations, to ensure that the most qualified staff are selected as Employee of the Month, the Director should have no less than three candidates from which to select. If a situation arises in which there have not been sufficient nominees to produce three candidates, then no selection will be made for that month.
  8. It is recommended that the Employee of the Month award should be adjusted to an Employee of the Quarter award. This is in recognition of the fact that many staff have already received the award. It would also ensure sufficient nominations for the award.
  9. More intensive use needs to be made of the Employee Suggestion Program. Recommendations include:
    - Requesting suggestions through the channels listed above, such as at roll call and through the Emerald Digest;
    - Generating more publicity for those suggestions which are received and awarded. This publicity could be via the Emerald Digest, roll call announcements, and could be typed out and displayed underneath the Employee of the Month picture.
  10. In order to provide immediate feedback to employees, those employees who submit a nomination or a suggestion should receive a receipt of acknowledgement from the Employee Incentive Committee. This would provide staff with a sense that at least their suggestions were being considered.



11. It is further recommended that an assessment be made of current Employee Incentive Programs in existence. Materials are currently available from the National Association of Suggestion Systems. Seattle City Light has a respected Employee Suggestion Program. These programs have many suggestions to offer, such as setting nominating quotas for managers and formulating objective, specific criteria by which an employee is nominated. By increasing nominations and by using objective criteria, only the highest qualified candidates will receive the award.

the board for a term of one year, until employment with the county is terminated, or until replaced by the county executive, whichever shall occur first;

B. A fifth member of the merit awards board shall be appointed by the chairman of the county council and shall be an elected official or full-time employee of the council;

C. The board shall have final authority in resolving all questions relating to the eligibility of suggesters, the adoption or rejection of suggestions submitted, and the determination of the amount of cash awards to a maximum of five hundred dollars;

D. The board shall meet in regular session at least once each month. Additional meetings may be called by the manager of the office of personnel. A majority of the members of the board shall constitute a quorum for the transacting of all business;

E. The board or any member of the board shall not reveal the identity of a suggester unless specifically authorized to do so by the suggester. (Ord. 1309 § 3, 1972).

3.13.040 Awards. The board shall evaluate each suggestion, taking into consideration departmental recommendations and the objectives of the merit awards suggestion program. Insofar as may be equitable and practicable, cash awards shall be granted as a percentage of the computed cost savings during the first year after implementation less the cost of implementation. The affected agency or department shall submit to the board an estimate of the cost savings which shall be audited and approved by the manager of the office of budgets and accounts before action is taken by the board. Awards in excess of five hundred dollars shall require the approval of the county council. If the foregoing formula, in the judgment of the board, does not suitably measure the merits of the suggestion, the board shall determine the amount it deems equitable. In cases where a cash award is not merited, the board may make appropriate commendation through a letter of appreciation, certificate of merit, or other means. (Ord. 1309 § 4, 1972).

3.13.050 Suggestion review. All suggestions shall be reviewed by the board one year after initial action is completed.

A. In the case of rejected suggestions, the board shall consider its current feasibility in light of changing conditions;

B. In the case of adopted suggestions, the board shall review the actual benefits derived from the suggestion. If experience indicates that the benefits derived from the suggestion are substantially greater than originally estimated, the suggester shall be eligible for an additional award based upon the difference between the original estimated value of the suggestion and the current valuation of the suggestion. (Ord. 1309 § 5, 1972).

3.13.060 Annual report. The board shall prepare and submit each year an annual report to the county executive covering the preceding calendar year. This report shall include:

- A. Number of suggestions approved for monetary and commendatory awards;
- B. Total of all cash awards granted;
- C. Administrative costs;
- D. Data indicating savings to the county derived from the program; and
- E. Any other information deemed pertinent. (Ord. 1309 § 6, 1972).

3.13.070 Rules and procedures. The merit awards board, in consultation with the manager of the office of personnel, shall have the authority to formulate rules and procedures concerning the processing of suggestions, granting of awards and all other matters pertaining to the implementation and operation of the merit awards suggestion program not specifically prescribed by this chapter, subject to the approval of the county administration officer. (Ord. 1309 § 7, 1972).

3.13.080 Administration. Administration functions shall be the responsibility of the manager of the office of personnel.

A. The office of personnel shall receive, record, and acknowledge receipt of suggestions, shall advise the suggester of any undue delay in the consideration thereof, and shall notify the suggester of action taken as soon as final consideration has been made.

B. The office of personnel shall refer all suggestions to the affected department or office which shall, within fifteen working days, report its findings and recommendations to the board. The departmental report shall indicate whether or not the suggestion has been adopted and the reasons therefor. If adopted, the department shall indicate the actual or estimated cost savings.

C. The manager of the office of personnel shall provide clerical and other assistance to the merit awards board as required. (Ord. 1309 § 8, 1972).

#### Chapter 3.14 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Sections:

- 3.14.010 Powers assigned.
- 3.14.020 Removals, suspensions, and demotions.
- 3.14.030 Secretary/chief examiner.
- 3.14.040 Rules and regulations.
- 3.14.050 Effective date.
- 3.14.060 Severability.

3.14.010 Powers assigned. The powers and duties of the sheriff's civil service commission under Chapter 41.14 RCW are hereby assigned to the personnel division of the department of executive administration except those powers and duties set forth in RCW 41.14.120. (Ord. 8179 § 1, 1987).

3.14.020 Removals, suspensions, and demotions. The sheriff's civil service commission shall continue to hear and decide cases regarding removals, suspensions, and demotions as provided in RCW 41.14.120. (Ord. 8179 § 2, 1987).

3.14.030 Secretary/chief examiner. The position of secretary/chief examiner of the sheriff's civil service commission is hereby abolished as of the effective date of this chapter. Any functions which have heretofore been performed by said secretary/chief examiner are hereby assigned to the manager of the personnel division. (Ord. 8179 § 3, 1987).



King County  
Department of Adult Detention

500 Fifth Avenue  
Seattle, Washington 98104

May 30, 1989

TO: All Concerned

FM: See Below

RE: Modification to the Department of Adult Detention  
"Incentive Awards and Recognition Program"

The Department of Adult Detention has initiated a program to recognize and reward employees whose performance so warrants or those employees who submit suggestions which provide either operational efficiency or tangible savings to the Department. The concept of such a program has been endorsed by the Executive, Executive Cabinet members, County Council Public Safety and Legal Services Committee Chairwoman Lois North, the Budget Office, the Personnel Division, the Prosecuting Attorney's Office, the State Auditor, and the affected unions. Local 519 has raised a concern about the process for nomination and selection of Employees of the Month and Employee of the Year. Following discussions with both Local 519 and AFSCME Local 21-AD, the following modifications to the existing policy are implemented effective immediately upon signature of this agreement. These modifications fully satisfy any concerns expressed by the affected exclusive bargaining representatives, including any concerns previously expressed in the form of grievances or unfair labor practices. Further, the parties agree that employees previously selected under the existing program shall receive retroactively all compensation and recognition to which they are entitled under the existing program.

1. The criteria against which an employee is evaluated for selection for Employee of the Month/Year remains unchanged.
2. Nominations for employees who are felt to be deserving of recognition may be submitted by either an employee's supervisor or an employee's colleagues, either individually or collectively.
3. All nominations, regardless of origination, shall be routed through the chain of command to the Director's Office. Individuals in the chain of command shall review and comment on each nomination received before further routing.
4. A screening committee shall be formed, composed of six members as follows: Two members nominated by DAD management, two uniformed staff members nominated by Local 519, two nonuniformed staff members nominated one each by Local 519 and AFSCME Local 21-AD. For the purposes of convening the group and conducting business, the Director shall designate one of the six members as chair.