



STATE of CONNECTICUT
Office of Governmental Accountability
State Contracting Standards Board

Special Meeting Agenda

Friday, September 20, 2024 - 10:00 A.M.

Location: 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT

Conference Room G009F

and *Virtual*

Board Members in Attendance:

Rochelle N. Palache, Chairperson (in person)

Thomas G. Ahneman, Board Member (virtually)

Alfred W. Bertoline, Board Member (in person)

Keith R. Brothers, Board Member (in person)

Bruce H. Buff, Board Member (in person)

Lauren C. Gauthier, Board Member (in person)

Donna M. Karnes, Board Member (virtually)

Salvatore C. Luciano, Board Member (virtually)

Stuart L. Mahler, Board Member (in person)

James S. Marpe, Board Member (in person)

Daniel S. Rovero, Board Member (virtually)

Gregory F. Daniels, Esq., Executive Director, ex-officio Board Member (in person)

Staff Members in Attendance:

Maritza Lopez, Accounts Examiner (in person)

Samson Anderson, Research Analyst (in person)

Carmen Hufcut, Training Specialist (virtually)

Aaron Felman, Staff Attorney (virtually)

Aleshia M. Hall, Administrative Assistant (in person)

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Palache at 10:02 am
 - a. Roll Call of Board Members

2. **Approval of Minutes**
 - a. Approval of the minutes from the August 9, 2024, SCSB Regular Meeting

A motion to accept the minutes as written was made by: Al Bertoline

The motion was seconded by: Lauren Gauthier

Motion was unanimously approved without discussion.

3. **Communications and Petitions**

a. **Sec. 4e-36 Contested Solicitations and Awards Subcommittee Report – Bruce H. Buff**

Bruce Buff reported that on September 9, 2024, the State Contracting Standards Board received a complaint from Common Cents EMS LLC located in Old Saybrook, Connecticut, regarding notification from the Department of Public Health on September 4, 2024, informing them that their company did not receive a multi-state contract. SCSB has received information from all interested parties and will render a decision before October 9, 2024, as required by statute. Lauren Gauthier noted for the record that the vendor contacted her through his state representative, and she directed him to the 4e-36 subcommittee.

b. **Privatization Contract Committee Report – Salvatore C. Luciano**

Nothing to report.

c. **Audit/Data Analysis Work Group Report – Alfred W. Bertoline**

Al Bertoline provided an update on the status of the FY'24 fiscal year audits, explaining that five have been completed and one is pending approval at this meeting. Another five audits are currently in process. All audit information that has been requested from agencies has been received and audits are in progress.

After clarifying that it was permissible under the rules of a special meeting, a motion was made by Al Bertoline for the Board to accept the audit report completed on Department of Health Report as written.

A brief discussion with Stuart Mahler, Mr. Bertoline clarified that the Board approved five completed audits at last month's meeting, the DPH audit would be the sixth audit, the DPH audit did not have any findings.

After close of discussion, the motion was seconded by: Bruce Buff
The motion was unanimously passed.

d. **Budget Sub-Work Group Report – Chair Brenda L. Sisco**

In the absence of Chair Brenda Sisco, this report was deferred for presentation by Executive Director Daniels during the Staff Report.

e. **Statutes, Regulations, Policies and Procedures Work Group – Chair Rochelle N. Palache**

Chair Palache announced that she will be appointing a chair to head this work group in the near future.

f. Personnel Review Sub-Work Group Report – Chair Rochelle N. Palache

Chair Palache announced that she will be appointing a chair to head this work group in the near future. Someone has expressed an interest, and she appreciates the support.

g. Training Work Group Report – Chair Rochelle N. Palache

A meeting of the Training Work Group was scheduled to take place on Wednesday, September 18, 2024; however, a quorum was not present, so the meeting had to be cancelled and will be rescheduled.

h. XL Center Work Group Report – Lauren C. Gauthier

Lauren Gauthier has reviewed the documents that were provided by CRDA. She does not want to categorize this as findings but does want to have a discussion regarding \$145 million of bonded money, \$20 million private investment and the question of public/private partnership. Our Board does not seek to answer that; however, in response to Senator Harding, who raised the question to the Board, the legislative may have to clarify the intent of the statute as it applies to P3's. It does appear that this is a little to no-risk situation for OBG and their \$20 million investment is being amortized over the length of the term, so they can write into profit/loss \$2 million per year of their investment and they are guaranteed \$4 million after operating expenses and a 50% share between OBG and the State of Connecticut. There are clauses in the contract, so if they do not default on the contract, they will be getting their \$20 million investment back. Additionally, there are two large pieces in any of these contracts, architects/designers and construction managers. This identifies SCI Architects and Dimeo Construction; however, she has not been able to have all the correspondence she wanted from CRDA to learn whether or not there was a bid process for these two vendors. The question is if Dimeo will be able to bid on their own work as we have seen at the Connecticut Port Authority. If there was not a competitive bid process for these vendors, it raises the question how competitive this is and then being able to bid on their own work. The Legislature tried to remediate and that was not signed by the Governor. Lastly is to make sure that we are including the flow down of 4e-36 contested solicitation information to all bidders.

Stuart Mahler added that the Hartford Courant reported today that Michael Freimuth is retiring and he has done fantastic work with the CRDA since early 2000's. Mr. Mahler noted that we have dealt with them before, and they have been very cooperative.

i. Staff Report

a. Administrative and Operations – Gregory F. Daniels, Executive Director

i. SCSB Budget Update

Executive Director Daniels reviewed the details of the SCSB's Biennium Budget Request for FY'26 - FY'27 that was submitted through DAS and OPM.

Director Daniels reported that he met with Budget sub-workgroup and reviewed the details of the submission and wanted to share the information with the full Board as well. Since the Board has not had opportunity to review finances in the past, Director Daniels wants to be transparent and share what are expenses are and how he and the staff collaborated with budget analysts at OPM and DAS to correct some technical accounting issues and inconsistencies of the past that were problematic from an accounting perspective to ensure that we move forward in a better position financially. The details of the budget were shared via PowerPoint presentation to illustrate to the Board Members what is to come in the biennium.

Stuart Mahler referred to the appearance of Charlene Casamento, Under Secretary of the Budget Division of OPM, at the regular meeting on September 13, 2024, and asked if we were working with her specifically on this and if she had planned to explain or do anything. Director Daniels clarified that we were working with the budget analysts assigned to our agency and Ms. Casamento had attended our meeting in hopes of meeting Chair Palache, who was not able to attend in person that day.

Director Daniels then returned to the PowerPoint slides, noting that the pie chart illustrates that 91% of our budget is staff salaries, which are guaranteed by OPM. The remaining 9% is Operating Expenses. It is a small amount of money. Within that 9%:

- 56% is allocated for Board Member fees (per diems, mileage expenses, or other items),
- 22% is for an intern
- the remaining 22% encompasses all other operating expenses including office supplies, telephones, and copiers. Director Daniels then reviewed each of these items and responded to questions.

Director Daniels emphasized that we are talking about a very small amount of money that we are managing conservatively and will continue to do so.

Director Daniels then reviewed the agency's past Fiscal Years expenses and allocations, noting the consistencies and variations in the manner in which repeated expenditures were being categorized. For example, we determined that some of the expenses we were absorbing could be reallocated through SmART agency DAS/BITS funding sources. He provided the example of our agency purchasing individual Adobe licenses in the past which could now be procured under a larger license purchased through BITS which would provide us with the same produce at a lesser cost.

Mr. Mahler inquired about utilization of the funding available through the OGA Shared Budget. Director Daniels welcomed the question and explained that there is still an OGA shared budget that each of the OGA agencies has access to. In the past, however, our agency has taken a disproportionate portion of that funding.

Mr. Mahler stated that a previous audit of OGA accounts did not yield any concerns in that area. Director Daniels did not speak or speculate on past audit findings; however, he shared that it was made very clear to us in budget discussions that some things that were being done in the past in terms of the budget process were improper. Going forward, our allocations will be on point, so we may anticipate utilizing only our assigned portion of that line item which is \$3,129 annually. We cannot presume any more than our allotted portion. If as the year progresses, those funds are required, we can work with our budget analyst and argue that our needs supersede those of other agencies.

In response to an inquiry, Executive Director Daniels shared that the FY'25 information was provided on this slide for reference only. FY'25 will be discussed at next month's meeting; he believes there needs to be a serious conversation and the Board will have to make decisions on how to move forward through this fiscal year.

Ms. Gauthier asked when the FY'25 budget was approved. Director Daniels responded that, according to the Board, the budget was not looked at prior to his coming into his position. He clarified that the FY'25 budget was finalized in August 2022, prior to him or the staff being hired.

Ms. Gauthier asked about the allocation set aside for accreditation expenses in FY'25. Chair Palache stated that she is not prepared to discuss FY'25 at this meeting and this discussion being deferred to the next meeting. Ms. Gauthier inquired about the date that payment is due for accreditation; she was informed that the payment is due in December. Director Daniels noted that the Training Work Group was scheduled to meet yesterday. Quorum was expected; but the meeting was not attended and had to be cancelled. Chair Palache stated that the meeting would be rescheduled.

Salvatore Luciano stated that he had not had a chance to look at the budget information. Regarding the training he stated, "if you don't ask the board when they're available then you just schedule the meeting, you will continue to have low attendance". To which Chair Palache responded that for this training meeting, there was an email sent and dates put out there. She has not yet been able to offer Carmen advance dates for rescheduling, but we are working on it.

Mr. Luciano referenced the accreditation is a nice-to-have, but not a need-to-have. Our statute says that the agencies must be trained, so they do not have a choice. The accreditation is nice, but it is not an expense that the Board approved of.

Mr. Luciano then asked if we were ever going to get a report from the Chief Procurement Officer because he answers to the Board and wants a presentation from him.

Chair Palache referred back to Director Daniels who reminded that we are in the throes of a Budget presentation and would like to stick to the agenda as this is a special meeting.

Mr. Luciano responded that it really is not a special meeting, it is the monthly meeting. Director Daniels clarified that it is a special meeting in accordance with FOIA law. Mr. Luciano said if Director Daniels filed late for the meeting or if he gave three days' notice. It becomes special if notice is given within 24 hours. Ms. Gauthier stated that it was posted more than 48 hours in advance, but for some reason, it was entered as a special meeting which now restricts our agenda. Chair Palache said she is getting up to speed on this and it would be discussed later. Director Daniels stated that was not the case. Mr. Luciano said it seems like you are hiding something if we just cannot add what should be part of a normal meeting like the Chief Procurement Officer's report.

James Marpe returned to the budget conversation and is perturbed that we are focusing on the details of the 9% that includes things such as licensure which are beyond the control of this Board. He feels it is odd that we consider such things. We can discuss whether or not we want accreditation, but he believes the more important discussion focuses on the 91%, and if our current staffing levels are adequate to meet the mandates of our Charter.

Executive Director Daniels concurred with Mr. Marpe and emphasized the visual in the pie chart. He explained that if we forego the request for \$17,500 for an intern, we will just lose \$17,500; that allocation will not be available to be used for something else. The same is likely for the accreditation allocation, that is a governing issue, and the Board can do whatever they feel is appropriate.

In response to Mr. Marpe's inquiry, Executive Director Daniels confirmed that we are not adequately staffed to meet all of our mandates. Ms. Gauthier interjected that we are focusing on the 9% because it is the only portion that the Board has control over.

ii. Monthly Report:

Executive Director Daniels solicited questions regarding the monthly report.

Ms. Gauthier requested that the minutes reflect that she received communication from Bryant Abbott on August 15, 2024. He sent a note regarding the meeting and forwarding of an FOI request sent to Mr. Longman and his response regarding the DEEP audit.

In reference to the August 2024 monthly report, Ms. Gauthier inquired about the reference in the legal section about development of the regulations that are supposed to be created by statute and asked if we have a list of which ones are being looked at first and where they are in the process. She understands this is a

long and cumbersome process. Director Daniels said that this project is awaiting startup of the Statutes and Regulations Committee. We need a chair for that committee to get it up and going. The Committee currently consists only of staff members. We could not get any Board members to participate. We need Board members to participate. Although the staff could undertake the project, there is a governance factor that needs to be incorporated, just like the other committees. Statutes and Regulations is very important to this Board. A writeup will be provided in due time.

Director Daniels also noted that the Board has received legal memos, but we have not received any responses on any of them.

Chair Palache welcomed Board members wishing to participate in the committee to provide their names. Ms. Gauthier volunteered.

Director Daniels shared that a draft regulations packet was submitted almost a year ago, but we have not received any feedback. He will reissue it to the Board.

4. Old Business

a. Consideration/Action on the draft Proposed Personnel Evaluation Criteria and Instrumentation for the Executive Director and Chief Procurement Officer positions – Lauren C. Gauthier

Ms. Gauthier reportedly worked with Al Ilg on his former evaluation proposal and shared it with the Board prior to this meeting. Handouts included the PER-125 State Performance Evaluation form. She noted that performance evaluations for the two executives are required annually by statute. The goal for this discussion is to create an evaluation criteria and evaluation instrument.

Ms. Gauthier received feedback from Al Ilg, Al Bertoline, Stuart Mahler, James Marpe, Bruce Buff, Sal Luciano, and Tom Ahneman who provided a markup and an instrument for consideration.

In reference to the criteria, she asked if everyone agreed with the process, and it was generally agreed. The criteria will inform the instrument.

Tom Ahneman offered that the approach makes sense.

Mr. Mahler pointed out that this is a very unique statute in that it the person appointed by the Governor has to go through a performance evaluation.

Ms. Gauthier disseminated the attached documents which were reviewed in detail and prompted a lengthy discussion.

1. Proposed Evaluation Criteria for CT State Contracting Standards Executive Director
2. Proposed Evaluation Criteria for Chief Procurement Officer
3. PER-125 State of Connecticut Human Resources Performance Appraisal
4. Sample Nonprofit CEO Performance Evaluation Form

In response to an inquiry by Daniel Rovero, Ms. Gauthier clarified that they are not evaluating the staff. The Board is focused on evaluating the Executive Director who completes the evaluations for the staff.

Ms. Karnes referred to Mr. Luciano's request to find out more information about Jon (referring to Chief Procurement Officer Jonathan Longman) and acknowledged that the topic is deferred to later in the meeting.

In reference to administrative functions, Mr. Ahneman thinks they might be dialing it down a little too deeply for a performance evaluation.

Chair Palache emphasized that this is a draft form that needs to be adjustable. The objective of the discussion is to move forward with a defined criterion. They need to be clear on what we are going to evaluate them on and then go forward accordingly. She noted that the statute and the job description are essentially the same.

Keith Brothers asked if we had a legal representative on the Board that could assist with interpretation of the statute, and he was informed that there is not a Board member that can serve in that capacity. On other boards on which he serves, there is normally someone outside the staff that can provide legal guidance, and he thinks that would be beneficial for this Board as well. It was clarified that Aaron Felman is our staff attorney, Executive Director Daniels is also an attorney, Chief Procurement Officer Jonathan Longman is not an attorney.

Ms. Gauthier asked that Aaron Felman provide a report of his progress as reported in the Monthly Reports regarding personnel evaluation procedures. Executive Director Daniels said that he would provide a report at the next meeting in October.

After a discussion regarding legislation, it was agreed upon that Director Daniels is not empowered to ensure the passage of proposed legislation, neither is the Board. Chair Palache does not see the point of noting specific legislative initiatives, instead it should be a general evaluation of support of legislative goals. Mr. Ahneman agreed. Ms. Gauthier agreed to reduce the items 13 items presented into one item to *support legislative priorities*.

Ms. Gauthier referenced a *retreat* that was mediated by Larry (referring to one of the former Chairs Larry Fox), that is listed under the heading Other Board Work Objectives, as adopted by the Board, February 10, 2023. Greg (referring to

Executive Director Daniels) and Jon (referring to Chief Procurement Officer Jonathan Longman) had just been hired and they were going to begin interviewing for staff. Mr. Ahneman believes that these should be summarized as *other Board work objectives*. That was agreed upon.

The next section reviewed contains 22 items and is entitled Assigned to the Executive Director by former Chair Walsh (but not approved by the Board). She believes this can be defined as *other tasks*. Executive Director Daniels clarified that this list refers to the legislative objectives that Chair Walsh delegated to the Board and staff. It was not necessarily directed to the Executive Director; the tasks were assigned to the person or work group best suited to accomplish each task and staff would assist. He will email the document that denotes assignments to the Board after conclusion of this meeting. Ms. Gauthier acknowledged that only two items were assigned to the Executive Director. Since it was never approved by the Board, she recommended striking those items that were assigned to the Board and retaining just the two that were assigned to the Director or strike completely. Mr. Marpe recommended *assist and oversee the deliverables on the part of the Board*. Chair Palache recommended that we keep the language broad and recommended that we strike the list entirely.

Mr. Luciano said they were chastised by Chair Walsh saying that these were things that the statute asked of us that we had not done. We had not done them because we did not have staff and that is why we fought so hard to get staff because the legislature wants us to do all these things. Now that we finally have staff we should finally be in a position where we can begin to meet all the obligations. He is disheartened that it has been over a year, and we have not been working on these things. He believes that these items need to be included in the evaluation; however, we need to be working diligently to accomplish these responsibilities. Ms. Gauthier agreed that if we did not direct the Director or approve this, it is covered under the other obligations. After more discussion, the list is being struck.

In response to Mr. Bertoline's inquiries, it was clarified that these items would be consolidated into two sentences. Mr. Bertoline expressed the need for the Board to set priorities. Mr. Mahler said that we are going to have to get a lot of younger people in because it is going to take a long time to get these things implemented.

In reference to the Chief Procurement Officer's evaluation, Ms. Gauthier stated that they can apply the same logic as was used for the Executive Director's discussion. The job description is identical to the statute, the objectives adopted by the Board can be summarized, and the list from Chair Walsh will be scratched. Mr. Ahneman agreed.

This concluded the conversation of the evaluation criteria.

Mr. Marpe confirmed with Ms. Gauthier that, from this discussion, she would create a one-page document for each criterion to be adopted at the October 2023 meeting. Chair Palache interjected that it would not be taken up in October, but likely be taken up in November. Ms. Gauthier continued that the finalized criteria would be provided weeks ahead of time so the time between the October and November meetings will be the evaluation period; November will be the evaluation. That is the schedule she is looking at right now.

Shifting the conversation to the evaluation instrument, she provided three templates for evaluation that might be useful. The PER-125 provided by Chair Palache was reviewed. The benefit is that this is a state-approved document that does not require review. Mr. Buff shared recommendations for expanding the comment space to provide additional information.

Mr. Ahneman believes PER-125 is a good start but does not go far enough. He would like to include leadership, communication, interactions with staff, Board, and other agencies.

Mr. Luciano shared that this was the form on which he was evaluated for 21 years. Supervisors also used the same form. If more comment space was needed, additional pages were attached. It was not used for program managers and higher ups because it does not include the leadership areas, but it is a good start. In response to Mr. Marpe's inquiry, Mr. Luciano confirmed that the evaluations in this format were helpful, especially for the first half of his career.

Mr. Ahneman created a document that was shared with the Board directly but was not available as a handout or display. The section for previous goals and future goals would be worthwhile to consider. Ms. Gauthier recommended taking the form of the PER-125 and including his boxes for risk management, communication skills, high management, etc. Mr. Ahneman said he has been using this form for 20 years to evaluate engineers. It opens a healthy discussion regarding the performance criteria. Mr. Ahneman recommended giving the form to the employee to complete and then sit down and compare notes with the supervisor. It gives an overview of what their skill set is, the resources they need, training they may be looking for, software knowledge, etc. It opens the door for a lot of conversations. He would recommend blending these documents.

Mr. Luciano thinks the form is fine with the addition of the leadership items.

The last form reviewed was the Sample Nonprofit CEO Performance Evaluation Form. Mr. Marpe noted several categories, such as relations, that are important to what we do that should be included. The form was reviewed that includes a section for the Board of Directors.

Ms. Karnes likes this form and thinks these should be combined.

In conclusion of this topic, Ms. Gauthier said she will send a draft of the evaluation instrument out to the Board members and asked that they promptly provide their feedback to afford an opportunity for multiple iterations before the October meeting.

Chair Palache asked that everyone acknowledge that they are receiving the emails being sent to the Board members. In response, Ms. Gauthier said she would be sure to share the materials with Mr. Mahler.

Ms. Gauthier continued that:

1. In October, the Board will vote and finalize our criteria and our evaluation instrument.
2. Between the October and November meetings, Board members would have time to sit with it. The Executives will be provided with the same evaluation and will complete a self-evaluation.
3. At the November 8, 2024, meeting we will come together and have a conversation.

Mr. Bertoline sought clarification by first confirming that in the October meeting everybody has the form. Are they expected to individually fill out a form for the Executive Director and Chief Procurement Officer? Are we going to come with our form to a meeting and go line by line and discuss that? Or are they to send their form in to be consolidated. He does not feel it is appropriate to go into an evaluation with 14 different evaluations plus Greg (referring to Executive Director Daniels) and Jon (referring to Chief Procurement Officer Jonathan Longman) and all discussing it together. Ms. Gauthier said that she would not be the one gathering and summarizing and does not feel the need for that administrative step. Instead, she envisions everyone coming in with their own form because this is an individual process. For her, when she evaluates it is influenced by her participation in the process.

Ms. Gauthier stated that the November agenda will reflect two executive sessions, one for the Executive Director and one for the Chief Procurement Officer and by statute they have the choice if they want their evaluation done in an open or closed session.

Ms. Karnes asked that everyone attend in person for the executive session if possible.

Mr. Marpe proposed, to avoid an excessively lengthy discussion, each prepare their evaluation form and submit in advance to the Chair who can consolidate so that what is discussed as a group is organized and sorted through. This is unlike anything he has experienced before. The role of the Board Chair is to collect the data and discuss in executive session. If

someone objects to her summarization, it would be discussed. Ms. Gauthier expressed that this is her concern that she does not want anything to get lost. Mr. Marpe explained that there is not such thing as 14 evaluations. With how difficult it is to determine what the form is going to look like, he cannot imagine what that forum would look like.

Chair Palache again reinforced that neither she nor the other new Board members can evaluate on the past and that is the tension that they must figure out. She is only interested in going forward. Mr. Buff shared that as the evaluation could be made based upon the feedback of the members who had been there during that time but agreed that if opinions differ it could be unwieldy. Chair Palache responded that is in conversation with someone to assume the role as Chair of the Personnel Work Group, but they are still in conversations and she is hoping that person will take on a lot of this work, but the timeline is not realistic for October; November is on the table. As we figure out the criteria and the instrument, they have to factor in that many were not here.

Ms. Gauthier pushed back that 11 of the 14 have been here and she does not feel it would be fair to ignore almost two years of work of the Board. Chair Palache said that based on the feedback she has received, this has never been an issue before, so we are coming up with criteria going forward in accordance with our statute because we were not doing it in this kind of formal setting prior to now. Ms. Gauthier confirmed that in the past evaluations were not done on paper but consisted of 12 or 14 sitting in a room and talking about it. Chair Palache confirmed that this did not take place last year. Ms. Gauthier said they forwent it because Greg (referring to Executive Director Daniels) was in his first year and they were having turnover of the Chair.

Mr. Luciano said when there was only one person, they had such a close relationship with him that the performance appraisal was every month. He was 100% transparent and they didn't need to evaluate him because he was getting feedback and evaluation every time we met. Since we do not have that relationship now with the current staff, and that is why we need to do the evaluation. Ms. Gauthier said that they did do a formal annual evaluation where they went into executive session and talked about the work of the board. Mr. Buff said that David (referring to David Guay, the former Executive Director) completed his own self-evaluation.

In response to Mr. Brothers inquiry, it was confirmed that the process for evaluation was not prescribed by statute. The annual evaluation should have been completed in February 2024, which was one year from date of hire.

b. Committee and Work Group Assignments – Chair Rochelle N. Palache

At the request of Chair Palache, Executive Director Daniels made a personnel announcement that Chief Procurement Officer Jonathan Longman requested leave through the DAS Human Resources which was approved; his expected date of return at the end of October 2024. In response to the discussion, Chair Palache confirmed that she was notified timely by Executive Director Daniels.

It was clarified to Mr. Luciano that he was not *put out* or *placed on leave*. He took leave.

Mr. Ahneman requested clarification to which Director Daniels explained that he cannot speak on it further but clarified that the leave was requested by the employee through the DAS Human Resources process and was approved by them. The leave began at the end of August; Director Daniels was later notified and communicated the information to the Chair. A notice did not go out to the Board. Chair Palache confirmed that they intended to announce it at last week's meeting.

Mr. Luciano said he wishes he had known earlier and would not have been so adamant about him doing a report. He believes this should have been on the agenda because the Chief Procurement Officer does report to the Board. He is surprised that they were not notified earlier and would have like to have been notified at the beginning of the meeting to be a little bit more tolerant and understanding of why there was no Chief Procurement Officer's report.

5. ~~New Business~~

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act Statutes on special meetings, this item was removed from the agenda.

6. Opportunity for Citizens to Address the SCSB

No citizens requested to address the Board.

7. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn at approximately 12:08 p.m. was made by Lauren Gauthier. The motion was seconded by Al Bertoline and Sal Luciano. The motion unanimously passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Aleshia M. Hall

Administrative Assistant

From: [Lauren Gauthier](#)
To: [OGA SCSB-Members](#); [Daniels, Greg](#); [Longman, Jonathan](#)
Subject: Proposed Personnel Evaluation Criteria and Instrument
Date: Friday, August 23, 2024 2:55:15 PM
Attachments: [Proposed Evaluation Criteria for CT SCSB Executives.docx](#)

EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I've taken a review of what AI Ilg has previously created, as well as the SCSB statutes, the job postings for both of the Executives, the adopted objectives of the Board from January 2023 to present day, and written up a proposed process for the evaluation, a review and recommendation of the PERS-125 evaluation instrument, and a listing of criteria to consider from the sources cited previously.

I would very much appreciate Board members taking some time to review this document, and provide feedback within the next week so that we can make necessary edits prior to the September 6 meeting, with the goal of being able to adopt the audit instrument and criteria, or make substantial progress towards that goal.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Please feel free to call or text my cell phone at 860-857-4655, or of course, email me.

[LINK TO PERS-125 EVALUATION INSTRUMENT](#)

Thank you.

Lauren Gauthier

Proposed Evaluation Criteria for CT State Contracting Standards Board Executives

Approach:

The Executive Director and the Chief Procurement Officer are highly placed Executives. Thus, my goal is to keep the evaluations simple, fair, and informative.

The Executive Director serves for a term coterminous with the Governor. The Executive Director is appointed by the Governor with the consent of one house of the General Assembly. The Board cannot remove or adjust the Executive Director's salary.

The Chief Procurement Officer is appointed by the Board for a six-year term, and serves at the pleasure of the Board. The Board cannot adjust the Chief Procurement Officer's salary.

The evaluations are an annual requirement of the Board, and should not be a task for the Executives or staff. These evaluations are not bound by any policy or procedure prescribed by DAS or any other state agency.

Proposed Process:

1. The Board votes on the evaluation criteria and evaluation instrument.
2. The Executives are provided 4 weeks to prepare a self-evaluation. Board members will use the same 4 weeks to use the evaluation criteria and evaluation instrument in preparation of the formal evaluation.
3. Following approval of the evaluation criteria and instrument, the Board will set a date for the evaluations, either during a regular meeting or special meeting created for that purpose. Each Executive will have their own evaluation period.
 - a. The agenda for such a meeting will include a provision for entering executive session. Each Executive will have their own agenda item. Each Executive may choose whether they want their individual evaluation to be conducted in a closed executive session or an open meeting.
4. The Board will render its final evaluation, and may include recommendations on performance or adjustment of expectations. Approved evaluations will be placed in the appropriate personnel file.
5. The date of the next annual performance will be tentatively set one year hence from the conclusion of this first evaluation.

Proposed Evaluation Instrument:

The Performance Evaluation and Recognition System (PERS) does not apply to the Executives. However, the evaluation instruments provided by the PERS can meet the Board's need in combination with the approved evaluation criteria. The PER-125 evaluation form distributed by the Chair seems to be able to meet the Board's need as a guide to the discussion of the performance evaluation, and so I would recommend using that rubric. As the PERS does not apply to the Executives nor the Board's evaluation, there is still flexibility in the discussion and

evaluation considerations, should the Board choose. Any modifications the Board would want to make to the form need to occur before the Board approves the evaluation instrument and before commencement of the 4-week self-evaluation period by the Executives.

Proposed Evaluation Criteria, Executive Director:

From the statute, the following criteria apply:

1. In consultation with the Chief Procurement Officer;
 - a. Conduct comprehensive planning with respect to the administrative functions of the board
 - b. Coordinate the budget and personnel activities of the board
 - c. Cause the administrative organization of the board to be examined with a view to promoting economy and efficiency
 - d. Act as the external liaison for the board
 - e. Execute such other duties as may be assigned by the chairperson of the board or the board, as applicable
2. Administrative supervision of the Chief Procurement Officer
 - a. Administrative supervision of the Chief Procurement Officer means to monitor and assist in the administrative aspects of the work performed by the Chief Procurement Officer, such as routine paperwork handling. Administrative supervision does not mean the supervision of the Chief Procurement Officer's duties as defined by statute, as that is done by the Board.

From the job description, the following criteria apply:

“Directs staff and operations of the State Contracting Standards Board; coordinates, plans and manages board administrative activities; formulates program goals and objectives; develops or assists in development of related policy; interprets and administers pertinent laws; evaluates staff; prepares or assists in preparation of board budget; maintains contacts with individuals both within and outside of board who might impact on program activities; serves as ex-officio, nonvoting member of the board; in consultation with the Chief Procurement Officer, conducts comprehensive planning regarding the administrative functions of the board; coordinates budget and personnel activities of the board; causes the administrative organization of the board to be examined with a view to promoting economy and efficiency; acts as external liaison for the board; performs related duties as required.”

Support Legislation, as adopted by the Board, February 10, 2023 for FY23:

1. HB 5692 “AN ACT CONCERNING OVERSIGHT OF CONTRACTS OF THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY”
2. SB 826 “AN ACT PROHIBITING CONSTRUCTION MANAGERS FROM SELF PERFORMING WORK ON CERTAIN QUASI-PUBLIC AGENCY PROJECTS”
3. SB 839 “AN ACT PROHIBITING STATE AND QUASI-PUBLIC AGENCIES FROM CHARGING SUCCESSOR FEES”

4. SB 873 “AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE CONTRACTING STANDARDS BOARD AND STATE CONTRACTING AGENCIES”

Support Legislation, as adopted by the Board, October 13, 2023 for FY24:

1. Cost-effectiveness evaluations shall be submitted to the Board.
2. A business case submitted to the Board shall include an analysis of the impact of the proposed privatization on protected classes of workers.
3. The budget for the Board shall be treated in the same fashion as other watchdog agencies such as the Freedom of Information Commission, State Election Enforcement Commission and Office of State Ethics.
4. Criminal conduct under C.G.S. § 4e-34 shall include any criminal conduct associated with prior procurement or contracting.
5. Quasi-public shall be considered to be a state contracting agency.
6. The statutes of the State Contracting Standards Board shall supersede any notwithstanding the language of any state contracting agency or any quasi-public agency.
7. A state contracting agency shall consider the financial condition of any private entity in evaluating a bid or a proposal.
8. In any solicitation of bids or proposals, a state contracting agency shall notify prospective bidders or proposers of their rights under C.G.S. § 4e-36.
9. Quasi-public contracts shall contain provisions for accountability, transparency, and results-based outcomes.
10. The definition of a core governmental function shall include the provision of essential human services to residents of the state who lack the support necessary to ensure basic human functions.
11. A state contracting agency shall post any awards of emergency procurements.
12. A business case shall include the qualitative impact of any privatization on the existing state workforce.
13. C.G.S. § 4e-16(c)(3) shall be revised to allow a state employee bargaining unit to submit a bid when the number of state employees impacted by a privatization contract is 25. The number of impacted state agency employees, as described above, shall include the cumulative impact of any privatization contract that increases the number of impacted state employees to 25.

Other Board Work Objectives, as adopted by the Board, February 10, 2023:

1. Creating definitions/regulations or legislative recommendations for MOAs and MOUs
2. Creating definitions/regulations or legislative recommendations for a Centralized Procurement Authority
3. Tightening of Privatization Provisions of the Statute
4. Suggested a Public Hearing of vendors and Board constituents
5. Define what regulations the SCSB needs to adopt, and which to recommend as changes to statute
6. Clarify authority of the Board to promulgate regulations on topics already or similarly covered by other state agencies

7. Increase Agencies under the Board's Jurisdiction
8. Review COVID-19 Pandemic purchasing, summarize findings and recommendations
9. Develop a Standardized Training Program, including topics:
 - a. Specifically for Agency Procurement Officers
 - b. Notification to Contractors of Bidder Appeal Rights
 - c. Procurement best practices
 - d. Continually update training and report issues noted to procurement employees
10. 10. Increase presence on social media
11. Generalized legislative outreach (build relationships with legislature)
12. Study the issue, definition(s) of public-private-partnerships, summarized findings and recommendations
13. Study Contracting under emergency powers

Assigned to the Executive Director by former Chair Walsh (but not approved by the Board)::

Of the January 12, 2024 deliverables, there were 22 total, plus several other items to "roll out" on the Board website. Of the 22 total, 2 were assigned to Board Member Al Ilg (personnel evaluations), 2 were assigned to Executive Director Daniels, and 18 were referred to the Training Workgroup.

The applicable deliverables were:

- §4e-5 Secure an Executive Branch list of all designated procurement officers
- §4e-2 Who is the minority "certified procurement" appointment?
- §4e-8 Convene four times annually, the Contracting Standards Advisory Council
- §4e-10 Review our ability to send statutory changes after July 1, 2012
- §4e-11 Provide best practices to the Secretary of State, Comptroller, Treasurer, and AG
- §4e-12 Provide best practices to the Legislative and Judicial branches
- §4e-14 Ensure contracts have provisions to assure accountability, transparency, and results-based outcomes
- §4e-22 Provide, with DAS' assistance, sole source bid regulations
- §4e-23 Issue waiver of bid rules
- §4e-24 Issue emergency procurement rules
- §4e-26 Issue rules for specifications for supplies and services
- §4e-27 Working with AG, issue procedures for cost reimbursement contracts
- §4e-28 Issue regulations directing contractors to provide timely accounting system access
- §4e-9 Review the creation of a Vendors and Citizens Advisory Panel
- §4e-41 Adopt regulations for Architectural and Engineering services
- §4e-42 Adopt regulations for bid security
- §4e-44 Adopt regulations for procurement of consultant services
- §4e-45 Adopt with the AG's assistance, infrastructure contract addendum formats
- §4e-46 Adopted regulations for contract modifications
- §4e-48 Prepare a list of other states that give in-state preference to calculate bids

- §4e-49 Prepare regulations when Metropolitan District of Hartford County is involved in procurement

The items to “roll out” on the SCSB website.

1. Audit reports
2. YouTube
3. Org Chart
4. Bio of Members
5. History of Board
6. Training video/Program Page

Proposed Evaluation Criteria, Chief Procurement Officer:

(appointed 12/9/2022)

From the statute, the following criteria apply:

1. In consultation with the Executive Director;
 - a. Conduct comprehensive planning with respect to the administrative functions of the board
 - b. Coordinate the budget and personnel activities of the board
 - c. Cause the administrative organization of the board to be examined with a view to promoting economy and efficiency
 - d. Act as the external liaison for the board
 - e. Execute such other duties as may be assigned by the chairperson of the board or the board, as applicable
2. Carrying out the policies of the Board relating to procurement including:
 - a. Oversight
 - b. Investigation
 - c. Auditing
 - d. agency procurement certification
 - e. procurement and project management training
 - f. enforcement of policies,
 - g. application of policies to the screening and evaluation of current and prospective contractors
 - h. recommending best practices
 - i. providing operational and administrative assistance to state agencies determined, by the board, to be in violation of sections 4e-16 to 4e-47 inclusive
 - j. oversee state contracting agency compliance with the provisions of statutes and regulations concerning procurement
 - k. monitor and assess the performance of the procurement duties of each agency procurement officer
 - l. administer the certification system and monitor the level of agency compliance with the requirements of statutes and regulations concerning procurement but not limited to, the education and training, performance and qualifications of agency procurement officers;

- m. review and monitor the procurement processes of each state contracting agency, quasi-public agencies and institutions of higher education; and
- n. Serve as chairperson of the Contracting Standards Advisory Council
- o. Serve as ex-officio member of the Vendor and Citizen Advisory Panel

From the job description, the following criteria apply:

“Coordinates, plans and manages board activities; formulates program goals and objectives; develops or assists in development of related policy; interprets and administers pertinent laws; evaluates staff; maintains contacts with individuals both within and outside of board who might impact on program activities; implements and enforces policies of the board relating to procurement including, but not limited to oversight, investigation, auditing, agency procurement certification, procurement and project management training; enforces policies and ensures application of policies to the screening and evaluation of current and prospective contractors; recommends best practices and provides operational and administrative assistance to state agencies in violation of contracting standards; oversees state contracting agency compliance with provisions of statutes and regulations concerning procurement; monitors and assesses the performance of the duties of Agency Procurement Officers; administers the certification system and monitors the level of agency compliance with requirements of statutes and regulations including, but not limited to, education and training, performance and qualifications of Agency Procurement Officers; reviews and monitors the procurement processes of each state contracting agency, quasi-public agencies, and institutions of higher education; serves as Chairperson of the Contracting Standards Advisory Council and as Chairperson and ex-officio member of the Vendor and Citizen Advisory Panel; may draft legislation; performs related duties as required.”

Objectives adopted by the Board, February 10, 2023 for FY24:

1. Establishing the Vendor & Agency Advisory Committees
2. Analysis of contracts under 20k by contractor to determine if contractors are taking advantage on under \$20k not subject to competitive bidding
3. Gain access to CORE System (STARS)
4. Understand, define, and categorize, the universe of state procurement
5. Study use of MOAs/MOUs – establish communication with the Administration
6. Review three-year procurement plans filed with OPM
7. Resume Triennial Audit process
8. Update analysis of competitive bidding on PSAs and POSs
9. Understand and review the supplier diversity program
10. Determine metrics for improvement and monitoring of progress
11. Monitor the posting of waivers on the state contracting portal
12. Review the OPM January 15th report, summarize findings and recommendations
13. Review IT contracts
14. Study the aging of contracts, including number of years and renewals

15. Collaborate with the Auditors of Public Accounts on the issue when the State contractor will not provide data without additional payment
16. Study contracts where the contractor is selected and then negotiates the price
17. Note which significant state contracts that are not in OPM's annual PSA report
18. Determine where design/build projects get listed
19. Continue to study and work with the Connecticut Port Authority. Conduct the audit of their procurement policies
20. Review the DOT and the agency response to Bill 920
 - a. Review Cost-Effectiveness Evaluations (CEE)
 - b. Review Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA)
 - c. Look into obstacles to implementing Bridge Safety Inspector Hiring (if any)



State of Connecticut Human Resources Performance Appraisal

Form #: PER-125

Revision Date: 8/4/2005

TYPE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

INITIAL PROBATIONARY ANNUAL PROMOTIONAL OTHER (*Specify*)

EMPLOYEE NAME	CLASS TITLE	DATE
DIVISION	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF LAST REVIEW

INSTRUCTIONS: Evaluate the employee on the job now being performed. Mark the box above the horizontal line that most nearly coincides with your overall judgment on each quality. The care and accuracy with which this appraisal is made will determine its value to you, to the employee and to the agency.

Consider the employee's performance since the last appraisal and show by a check (x) whether he/she has regressed, remained the same, or shown improvement in each of the qualities listed to the left.

JOB ELEMENTS	GOOD			LESS THAN GOOD		HAS IMPROVED	LITTLE OR NO CHANGE	HAS REGRESSED
KNOWLEDGE OF WORK: Consider knowledge of job gained through experience, general education specialized training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	Well informed on all phases of work.	Knowledge thorough enough to perform without assistance.	Adequate grasp of essentials. Some assistance.	Requires considerable assistance.	Inadequate knowledge.	COMMENTS		
QUANTITY OF WORK: Consider the volume of work produced under normal conditions. Disregard errors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	Rapid worker. Unusually large production.	Turns out large volume.	Average.	Volume below average.	Very slow worker.	COMMENTS		
QUALITY OF WORK: Consider neatness, accuracy and dependability of results regardless of volume.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	Exceptionally accurate, practically no mistakes.	Seldom necessary to check work.	Acceptable, usually neat, occasional errors or rejections.	Often unacceptable, frequent errors or rejections.	Too many errors or rejections.	COMMENTS		
ABILITY TO LEARN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
NEW DUTIES: Consider the speed with which employee masters new routine and grasps explanations. Consider also ability to retain knowledge.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	Exceptionally quick at learning and adjusting to changed conditions.	Learns rapidly. Retains instructions.	Average instruction required.	Requires a great deal of instruction.	Very slow at absorbing new routines. Poor memory.	COMMENTS		
INITIATIVE: Consider the tendency to contribute, develop and/or carry out new ideas or methods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	Initiative resulting in frequent saving in time and money.	Resourceful, can meet and handle situations in an efficient and timely manner.	Shows initiative occasionally.	Rarely shows any initiative.	Need constant prodding.	COMMENTS		
COOPERATION: Consider manner of handling work relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	Goes out of way to cooperate.	Gets along well with associates.	Acceptable.	Shows reluctance to cooperate.	Very poor cooperation.	COMMENTS		
JUDGMENT: Does employee think intelligently and make decisions in a logical manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	Thinks quickly, logically outstanding.	Judgment usually logical.	Fairly reliable.	Inclined to be illogical.	Poor, unreliable.	COMMENTS		
OTHER ELEMENTS: Consider other elements of job performance which are not included above, yet are job related, i.e. attendance, physical performance on job, supervisory ability, affirmative action responsibilities. *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	COMMENTS							

If comments pertaining to supervisory ability are appropriate, ability to delegate authority, to get work done through subordinates, and observance of personnel and affirmative action policies should be considered.



State of Connecticut Human Resources
Performance Appraisal

Form #: PER-125

Revision Date: 8/4/2005

INSTRUCTIONS: Based on the appraisal you have made on the reverse side, please answer the following questions in your own words

DO YOU SEE ANY NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT ON THE PREVIOUS FACTORS? (If "Yes", please explain)

Yes No

IS EMPLOYEE WELL SUITED FOR THE TYPE OF WORK BEING DONE? (If "No", indicate type of work that would appear to be more suitable)

Yes No

WHAT CONTRIBUTION HAS EMPLOYEE MADE TO DEPARTMENT, DIVISION, OR BUREAU, BEYOND NORMAL REQUIREMENTS OF POSITION?

WHAT WOULD BE YOUR OVERALL EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEE?

Excellent Good Satisfactory Fair Unsatisfactory

Table with 4 columns: RATED BY, SIGNATURE, TITLE, DATE. Rows include REVIEWED BY, APPROVED BY, and EMPLOYEE.

NOTE TO EMPLOYEE: Your signature confirms that you have seen this report and discussed it with your supervisor. It does not indicate your agreement with or approval of the rating.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED AFTER DISCUSSION OF APPRAISAL WITH EMPLOYEE

WHAT WAS THE ATTITUDE OF THE EMPLOYEE TOWARD DISCUSSION OF APPRAISAL?

IF IMPROVEMENT IS INDICATED, WHAT SUGGESTIONS HAVE YOU MADE?

REMARK FURTHER COMMENTS YOU MAY HAVE FOR IMPROVEMENT

Table with 4 columns: CERTIFIED BY, SIGNATURE, TITLE, DATE

State Contracting Standards Board							
Employee Name / Position:	-	Evaluation Period:	2024				
Evaluating Manager:	-	Date of Hire:	1/1/2022				
Evaluation Date:	1/1/2024	Type of Evaluation:	Annual / Midyear				
<i>COMMENTS: Every evaluation form should include the basic information on the evaluator, employee being reviewed, date and time, etc.</i>							

COMMENTS: Evaluation forms generally tend to include a combination of the following sections. They are: Instructions, Definition of Scoring System, Performance Categories Rated w/ Scoring System, Discussion Topics W / Written Feedback, Commentary on Goal Achievement, Commentary on Future Goals. Sample evaluation topics and questions will be presented below, and can be modified to suit each office.

DEFINITION OF SCORING SYSTEM / PERFORMANCE RATING

1 - NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	2 - DEVELOPING	3 - STANDARD	4 - EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	5 - EXCEPTIONAL	N/A - NOT APPLICABLE
-----------------------	----------------	--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

- 1 - Performance in this area does not comply with State standards and is in need of improvement
- 2 - Employee is developing the skills applicable to his/her staff level, and is expected to achieve success as a result of time and resources devoted to development
- 3 - Employee meets expectations
- 4 - Employee consistently exhibits baseline characteristics and often exceeds expectations
- 5 - Employee significantly and consistently exceeds expectations and is recognized as a primary resource within the State in this area
- N/A - Performance in this area is not applicable to the employee

COMMENTS: There are endless variations on the scaled scoring system, however having a 5-tier system enables the ability to set the "standard" performance, and rate performance above or below the standard. Definitions of each rating should be provided to encourage dialogue when significant differences exist between a reviewer and reviewee's scoring occurs.

COMMENTS: Note that the evaluation template below is tailored specifically to procurement staff and should be modified to evaluate non-procurement staff. Again also note that the scoring system and performance ratings should be customized to each employees job description. Employees should be rated against their skill level and experience.

RATING LIST 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES RATED W/ SCORING SYSTEM

COMMENTS: Below is a collection of sample evaluation questions and performance categories. Both the reviewer/manager and the employee fill out the form and provide scores. This section can be broken into logical subsections, such as "technical abilities", "professional capabilities", "communication skills", etc. The dialogue of the review should basically revolve around the scores for each section, with more focus on scoring differences between the two parties. Each question may have multiple points or phrases, but the main theme of each question should be consistent through all of those points.

TECHNICAL SKILLS		
QUESTION	RATING	COMMENTS
Solves complex procurement problems and uses sound procurement judgment. Has a firm understanding of procurement principals. Prepares clear, organized, and concise procurement reports. Is able to provide innovative solutions and techniques to procurement problems.		
Reads and understands the applicable legislation and regulations. Is knowledgeable of the State's technical resources and library.		
Shows the ability to view procurement problems from different perspectives.		
Has worked on a wide array of projects and has experience in different contract types. Has the versatility to work on a range of projects.		
Develops analytical models for solving complex problems. Data collection focuses on relevant data and not simply sheer volume. Draws appropriate conclusions from data and analysis. Considers alternative methodologies, solutions and/or approaches for the betterment of the project at hand.		
Understands the balance between accuracy and thoroughness and efficient production. Establishes and/or recognizes flaws in procedures and policies and actively promotes revisions.		
Employee seeks improvement through seminars, trade magazines, research, training programs, and self-education.		

--	--	--

COMMUNICATION SKILLS		
QUESTION	RATING	COMMENTS
Has the ability to understand and follow instructions, as well as the ability to provide clear direction and guidance.		
Actively participates intra-office team meetings and contributes insightful input when appropriate. Provides 'lessons learned' at regular staff meetings and shares experiences with co-workers that could benefit the State.		
Uses tactful, discretionary communication skills both written and verbal, communicates professionally and courteously with both co-workers and with those outside the office.		
Provides and accepts appropriate feedback, is willing to face and resolve conflicts. Is open and honest. Treats all individuals both within and outside the State with respect and as professionals.		
Demonstrates effective listening skills and follows directions. Demonstrates effective verbal communication skills in an organized and logical manner. Listens to opposing viewpoints and appropriately expresses disagreement. Demonstrates effective presentation skills.		
Demonstrates ability to prepare and logically organize written documents. Documents are clear, concise and follow a logical path to an appropriate conclusion. Documents are grammatically correct and free of misspellings, typos and punctuation errors. Documents exhibit precise language and compelling arguments.		

TIME MANAGEMENT		
QUESTION	RATING	COMMENTS
Properly estimates the time needed for task completion and tracks progress accordingly, notifying staff or Board as problems arise that affect the schedule		
Able to manage multiple concurrent projects effectively		
Is able to prioritize tasks appropriately, and responds to all correspondence in a timely manner		
Completes work with minimal errors and misjudgments. Work completed under tight deadlines and at a fast pace does not suffer from avoidable misinterpretations and mistakes.		
Meets deadlines thru planning in lieu of rallying at the final hour. Achieves high productivity by establishing priorities which reflect the needs of the project and personal workload. Works the hours needed to meet the objectives. Effectively multi-tasks.		
Learns from mistakes; same mistakes are not repeated.		
Obtains high productivity by using or creating tools such as spreadsheets, templates, software, etc. Shows initiative in identifying opportunities to improve performance. Displays curiosity and a genuine desire to learn, investing time to develop skill sets and improve competency.		
Follows Board's direction to complete tasks successfully by understanding the scope & schedule. Seeks clarification to ensure understanding of goals and expectations; does not spin wheels. Understands when to ask for advice and/or assistance with tasks due to looming deadline.		
Appropriately estimates the effort require for assignments. Tracks results and reports to Board. Appropriately interprets performance and budget variances and adjusts performance on subsequent projects		
Makes effective backup plans, adapts to change, and implements alternate action plans		

Arrives on-time and is prepared for meetings, both in the office and outside the office.		

RISK MANAGEMENT

QUESTION	RATING	COMMENTS
Understands the Board's legislative obligations and readily recognizes scope and potential liability risks to the Board and acts appropriately to mitigate.		
Identifies potential procurement risks by implementing risk management plan prior to beginning work on contract review. Effectively communicates potential risk to other team members.		
Has an understanding of contracts and legal provisions. Understands each type of contract and ensures that the State is adequately represented for each procurement reviewed.		
Has a thorough understanding of legislative terms and conditions for each procurement, in particular the allocation of risk.		

5 - State CULTURE AND VALUES

QUESTION	RATING	COMMENTS
Employee shows commitment to achieving genuine results for the people of CT with emphasis on quality. Demonstrates teamwork, cooperation, dependability and gives credit to others when due.		
Shows integrity, maintains confidentiality and is trustworthy and honors commitments. Communicates honestly and effectively, receives criticism appropriately and is approachable. Is accountable, seeks added responsibility, and demonstrates initiative.		
Complies with ethical business conduct. Employee respects privacy of employee communications and personal property. Protects the confidentiality of State's and Board's sensitive information. Can be relied upon to confer with Chairperson when questions of ethical business conduct arise.		
Is accountable for responsibilities, demonstrates a strong work ethic, uses integrity when faced with challenging decisions, and is known as being dependable both within and outside the office.		
Is a "self-starter" and is a motivated worker, able to work independently when needed, and is able to adjust to unfamiliar conditions and work environment.		
Is able to prioritize tasks appropriately, and responds to all correspondence in a timely manner.		
The employee recognizes and is aware of his/her strengths, limitations, and weaknesses.		
Willingly participates in State functions and generally contributes positively to the day-to-day State culture.		
Recognized as a technical resource on certain subject matters and enthusiastically mentors younger staff.		
Has a firm understanding of State and Board policies, demonstrates through his/her actions and leads by example to other staff members.		

--	--	--

GOOD PROCUREMENT		
QUESTION	RATING	COMMENTS
Gathers and shares intelligence whenever dealing with State agencies and recognizes the importance of good procurement. Voluntarily looks for good procurement opportunities while meeting with State agencies, while discussing contract related matters with agencies or other consultants or in social networking environments.		
Recognizes the importance of procurement practices. Maintains good relationships with each agency's team and gathers intelligence relative to agency's practices and organization. Identifies and/or initiates opportunities for discussion relative to good procurement.		
Recognizes potential problems relative to relationships with State agencies and actively defuses them. Remains calm when dealing with emotional agency personnel. Understands potential risks to the Board and takes a role in mitigating such risks. Ensures that the State's and Board's expectations are clearly understood prior to proceeding with project.		

PROJECT MANAGEMENT		
QUESTION	RATING	COMMENTS
Employee is committed to the training of younger staff, sharing of information, and shows and interest in the development of others.		
Employee is able to compile the appropriate team and staff for a project.		
Prepares and maintains project status reports. Manages projects and staff with good judgment understanding and protecting the Board's quality goals. Consistently attains project goals.		
Remains in contact with agency relative to outstanding information requested and fosters an understanding of our common procurement interests in the project.		
Writes letters / reports that are clear and concise. Represents the Board in regulatory and legislative negotiations.		
Effectively plans and manages projects for procurement success. Consistently achieves Board's target goals		

FEEDBACK ON MANAGEMENT		
QUESTION	RATING	COMMENTS
Do you feel that the State stays current with technology and industry standards?		
Does the management team effectively communicate the Board's objectives? Do you feel that the management team welcomes feedback and suggestions?		
Do you feel that the Board respects and values the contributions of the staff and rewards them appropriately?		
Do you feel that the management team approachable and takes a sincere interest in the staff and their development?		

Does the Chairperson stay current with technology and industry standards, and is the Chairperson a resource, offering mentoring when necessary?		
Does the Chairperson clearly define objectives and appropriately plans for successful results?		
Does the Chairperson respect and value your contributions and takes the necessary time to discuss and address issues?		
Is the Chairperson is approachable? Does the Chairperson take a sincere interest in your success and development?		

WRITTEN FEEDBACK

COMMENTS: Some performance categories cannot be effectively evaluated with numerical scoring alone. An effective review contains a section where the reviewee is able to provide written responses to open ended questions. This enables both parties to expand on topics that are not easily defined by a discreet 'score', and also tends to foster a healthy dialogue. This section is a logical place for a discussion on goals performance and a discussion on future goals, both of which are included below.

DISCUSSION ON PERFORMANCE AND ACTION PLANS

TOPIC	RESPONSE
Considering the responses noted above, in what areas does the reviewee need further development, and how will this development be achieved?	
What are the reviewee's greatest strengths?	
In what areas has the reviewee excelled since the last review?	
In what areas does the reviewee see room for improvement for the Board as a whole?	

GOALS PERFORMANCE AND FUTURE GOALS MATRIX

COMMENTS: An effective way to manage goal performance and progress is to define a set of parameters in order to achieve those goals. The goals matrix above ensures that the goals are specific, measurable, appropriate and achievable for the staff member setting the goal, and are associated with a deadline.

GOAL PERFORMANCE MATRIX

PREVIOUS GOAL	DEADLINE	ACHIEVEMENT	COMMENTS

FUTURE GOALS MATRIX				
GOAL	DEADLINE	ACTION ITEMS	NEEDS / MATERIALS / RESOURCES	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR

EMPLOYEE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT & SIGNATURES

COMMENTS: It is essential that both the reviewer and reviewee sign and date the review document for record purposes. The primary copy of the review document should be kept in the employee's file with Human Resources. Keeping a record of the evaluation serves both as a reminder of the previous review, but also as a means of documentation for poor performance and risk management.

Employee Acknowledgement:

I have reviewed this document and discussed it's contents with the Board (SCSB), and have been advised of my performance status accordingly.

REVIEWEE _____ DATE _____	REVIEWER _____ DATE _____
REVIEWEE _____ DATE _____	REVIEWER _____ DATE _____



NONPROFIT LEADERSHIP CENTER

Sample Nonprofit CEO Performance Evaluation Form

Use the scale below to assess your nonprofit CEO or executive director in the following categories: 1) organizational performance, 2) community relations, 3) financial management and legal compliance, and 4) board of directors. If you select “unacceptable” for any of the evaluation areas, please explain why you feel that way in the comments at the end of the section. There is also an area to provide open-ended feedback at the end of this form.

Evaluation Scale

- 5 Consistently exceeds expectations
- 4 Consistently meets and exceeds expectations
- 3 Consistently meets expectations
- 2 Partially meets expectations
- 1 Unacceptable
- 0 Don't know

Organizational Performance

Skill or Ability	Score
Communicates the organization’s vision internally and externally.	
Manages and leads the organization in a manner that ensures excellence and impact.	
Works with the board and management staff to develop strategies for achieving mission goals and financial viability.	
Demonstrates quality of analysis and judgment related to progress, opportunities and the need for changes.	
Builds respect and profile for the organization with its various constituencies.	

Manages and leads goals for excellence and impact.	
Overall Rating on Organizational Performance	

Comments on organizational performance:

Community Relations

Skill or Ability	Score
Serves as an effective spokesperson for the agency; represents the organization and its point of view of the organization to agencies, organizations and the general public.	
Establishes sound working relationships and cooperative arrangements with providers, governmental agencies, community councils and other community groups.	
Overall Rating on Community Relations	

Comments on community relations:

Financial Management & Legal Compliance

Skill or Ability	Score
Ensures adequate oversight of all funds, including developing and maintaining sound financial practices.	
Works with the staff, finance committee and board to prepare budgets, monitor progress and initiate changes.	
Ensures investments are developed, executed and modified to maximize mission.	

Ensures the organization operates within budget guidelines.	
Overall Rating on Financial Management & Legal Compliance	

Comments on financial management and legal compliance:

Board of Directors

Skill or Ability	Score
Effectively implements policy as determined by the board.	
Works well with board officers.	
Provides appropriate, adequate and timely information to the board.	
Sees that the board is kept informed on the condition of the organization and all important factors influencing it.	
Works effectively with the board as a whole	
Overall Rating on Board of Directors	

Comments on board of directors:

Qualitative Questions

1. What are our CEO's two to three greatest strengths?
2. What areas of opportunity do you see for our CEO's improvement or growth?
3. What are our organization's priorities in the coming year?

4. How can our CEO help you be a more effective board member in the coming year?

Summary Rating

- 5 Consistently exceeds expectations
- 4 Consistently meets and exceeds expectations
- 3 Consistently meets expectations
- 2 Partially meets expectations
- 1 Unacceptable
- 0 Don't know

Your rating _____

Comments: