North Vancouver District
Public Library

CONNECTING COMMUNITY. SHARING KNOWLEDGE. INSPIRING STORIES

Att doc_7.1.3

MANAGEMENT REPORT

DATE:	October 4, 2016
AUTHOR:	Jacqueline van Dyk – *Director, Library Services*
MEETING DATE:	October 27, 2016
TO:	NVDPL Board
FROM:	Jacqueline van Dyk – *Director, Library Services*
SUBJECT:	**HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE UPDATE**

SUMMARY

This report highlights the work completed by the HR Committee to October 3, 2016. The updated work plan, on page 2, shows the completed items as well as the remaining tasks as outlined in the HR Committee's Terms of Reference.

PURPOSE

This report is for information.

ATTACHMENTS

This report includes the following appendix:

I. Approved Human Resources Committee Minutes – June 13, 2016

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE WORK PLAN – TO DATE OCTOBER 3, 2016

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES	Quarter 1 **Meeting Date:** March 23, 2016	Quarter 2 **Meeting Date:** June 13, 2016	Quarter 3 **Meeting Date:** October 3, 2016	Quarter 4 **Meeting Date:** November 1, 2016
Committee Terms of Reference	✓ Review HR Committee Terms of Reference			
Director of Library Services, including Annual Performance and Compensation Review	✓ Develop and Revise Performance Review System as Needed ✓ Review Performance Work Plan and Goals	✓ Develop and Revise Performance Review System as Needed		☐ Gather and Review Board feedback on Director Goals and Performance Outcomes ☐ Review Director Total Compensation Package ☐ Make Recommendation to Board on Director Evaluation and Total Compensation Package ☐ Formal Director Evaluation
Policy Review & Development		✓ Review Outstanding HR Policy from Policy Refresh Project ✓ Complete Board Guideline on REVIEW OF DIRECTOR OF LIBRARY SERVICES	✓ B-OHS-03 POSITIVE WORKPLACE ENVIRONMENT: ANTI-BULLYING AND HARRASSMENT – conduct annual review of policy/management guideline; recommend any updates to the Board	☐ Determine the HR policy suite review cycle
Support Director as Needed				

FINAL REMARKS

A discussion of the Committee's work plan and timetable is valuable so that its activities can be incorporated into the Library Staff work plans for the year. Activities and decisions of the Human Resources Committee support the goals of the Library Board.

North Vancouver District
Public Library

CONNECTING COMMUNITY. SHARING KNOWLEDGE. INSPIRING STORIES

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING
2nd QUARTER

MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016 – 5:00 PM
Lynn Valley Library – Board Room, 3rd Floor
1277 Lynn Valley Road, North Vancouver, BC

MINUTES

ATTENDEES

Library Board
Mark Jefferson – Committee Chair
David Porter – Board Chair/Ex-officio
Allison Rzen – Trustee
Phil Webber – Trustee

Management / Staff
Jacqueline van Dyk – Library Director/Ex-officio
Corinne McConchie – Mgr, Collection Mgmt & Access
Deborah Hudson – Executive Assistant (Temp.)

Guests
Saira Walker– Manager, HR (DNV)

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Committee Chair Mark Jefferson called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM

Mark Jefferson asked about the timing and sequencing of the HR Committee Minutes as compared to the monthly Regular Board Meeting Minutes, noting that the HR Committee Meeting Minutes are not received until the following HR Committee Meeting, with a gap of a couple of months. Library Director Jacqueline van Dyk and Executive Assistant Deborah Hudson explained that the spacing of all the Board and Committee Meetings, and the time required to prep for each meeting and to turn around the Minutes for each meeting, does not usually allow for the Minutes of any meeting to be circulated in advance of the agenda packages, which are circulated a week before each meeting.

MOVED by David Porter and SECONDED by Allison Rzen

THAT the Agenda be adopted. (HR-16-06-01)

MOTION CARRIED.

<Saira Walker arrived at 7:04pm and was introduced around the table.>

2. ADMINISTRATION

2.1 Approval of HR Committee Minutes – March 23, 2016

Allison Rzen questioned whether the documentation of the December 21, 2015 In-camera Meeting within the March 23, 2016 Minutes was best practice. Library Director Jacqueline van Dyk noted that in this particular case that nothing about the December 21, 2015 meeting recorded in the March 23, 2016 Minutes was confidential, and that it simply documented an otherwise undocumented meeting. Mark Jefferson agreed. He added that it was good that the HR Committee had had the discussion on December 21, 2015, and that it is good that the meeting has now been documented.

MOVED by Allison Rzen and SECONDED by David Porter

THAT the March 23, 2016 HR Committee Minutes are approved. (HR-16-06-02)

MOTION CARRIED.

2.2 Updated HR Committee Work Plan

The updated HR Committee Work Plan was presented to the HR Committee for their review and comment. Mark Jefferson liked the visual presentation of the Work Plan, and the spacing of the committee goals along the timeline. Phil Webber noted that the Director's Performance Evaluation scheduled in the Fall will be based on feedback that has yet to be received. Jacqueline van Dyk noted that the agenda items to be discussed over the balance of the meeting will contribute to clarifying the process for the Director's Performance Evaluation.

2.3 HR Terms of Reference Housekeeping

Allison Rzen noted that a consequence of changing the wording in the HR Committee Terms of Reference to read "*regular* Performance Review of the Director of Library Services" instead of "*annual* Performance Review of Director of Library Services" is that it opens up the possibility of a "Hurry-up Offense" approach being adopted which may delay support for conducting the Library Director's Performance Review down the road to the point of not conducting them. David Porter agreed that it would be good to include boundaries in the committee guidelines, to ensure that the Library Director's Performance Evaluation is conducted at least every two years.

MOVED by David Porter and SECONDED by Allison Rzen

THAT the HR Committee recommend housekeeping edits to B-GOV-02.3 TERMS OF REFERENCE: HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE be approved and adopted by the Board. (HR-16-06-03)

MOTION CARRIED.

3. COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS

3.1 Motions Required

3.1.1 HR Policy Update: Exit Interviews

Corinne McConchie, NVDPL Manager, Collections Management and Access, introduced the draft Management Guidelines on Exit Interviews, which would replace and expand on the current policy statement.

MOVED by Allison Rzen and SECONDED by David Porter

THAT the HR Committee recommend to the Board that existing Personnel Policy 7.4 Exit Interviews be removed in lieu of MG-HR-01.10 EXIT INTERVIEWS. (HR-16-06-04)

MOTION CARRIED.

4. FOR DISCUSSION

4.1 Draft BG-HR-10: Board Guidelines for the Review of the Director of Library Services

Mark Jefferson asked Library Director Jacqueline van Dyk and Corinne McConchie, NVDPL Manager, Collections Management and Access, if they wished to speak to the Management Report on the issue of the Board Guidelines for the Review of the Director. Corinne McConchie offered that a review of the Draft Board Guidelines BG-HR-10 would help to put the next item on the Agenda, the Updated Draft of the Director Assessment Survey, into context in terms of process. Jacqueline van Dyk noted that as per the current schedule in the Draft Guidelines, the timing of the various processes leading up to the Director Review seem to all occur at once. Mark Jefferson agreed and noted that that was part of the reason that the process for the Review of the Director was not completed last year. Phil Webber added that there needs to be an alignment of the Assessment Survey as part of the process of the Director Review, as it feeds into recommendations for the Personal Growth Plan. He wondered if there needs to be a place in the schedule for a semi-annual check-in with the Director, as it is not currently mentioned in the Draft Guidelines. He further noted that, as it stands, the schedule for the Review of the Director does appear to be jammed up in October and November, as Jacqueline van Dyk had indicated. Phil Webber asked if the Assessment Survey, the Personal Growth Plan, and the Stakeholder Review should be listed in the Guidelines as components of the Director Review. Mark Jefferson noted that he considers these to be Assessment Tools, for information gathering only, not as part of the actual Review of the Director itself. Phil Webber suggested that the Assessment Tools be listed in Draft Guidelines.

ACTION: The wording "Additional assessment tools as determined by the Human Resources Committee" to be listed under the Performance Management Framework in the Draft Guidelines for the Review of the Director of Library Services.

Allison Rzen felt that the term "Performance Management" implied a negative situation that you are trying to rectify, and that the Guidelines need to be written in such a way that it is clear this is not the intended meaning.

Jacqueline van Dyk noted that the term "Library Director" is not consistent with many other libraries where the equivalent position is known as the "Chief Librarian", and neither is it consistent with equivalent department heads of other departments at the District, such as the Chief Financial officer and the Fire Chief, and suggested that the title "Library Director" be reconsidered as the "Chief Librarian". There was general support for this suggestion.

Allison Rzen noted that a Stakeholder Review should be done occasionally, and not every year. When it is done, it can be done earlier in the year in terms of the review process. There was general agreement.

Phil Webber raised the issue of pay increments for the "Chief Librarian". It was noted that Jacqueline van Dyk's anniversary date is September 30th, and that the compensation review takes place within the Annual Review Cycle, which is completed by the Board, and not the District CAO. Phil asked if there was another policy on the subject of staff compensation. Corinne McConchie confirmed that there is a policy with Management Guidelines for staff: *MG-HR-02.0: Exempt Staff Compensation*. Mark added that the policy and guidelines do not speak to the "Library Director/Chief Librarian". Phil Weber felt that the Management Guidelines *MG-HR-02.0: Exempt Staff Compensation* may provide some indications for the "Library Director/Chief Librarian".

In reference to the schedule under the Draft Board Guidelines for the Review of the Director, Allison Rzen asked whether there was a need to separate out the desired results. For example, it was not clear at which point Jacqueline van Dyk would be invited to provide a commentary and written response as part of the review process, prior to the final report of the HR Committee. Jacqueline van Dyk asked whether the written report from the HR Committee would come out of the face-to-face meeting conducted by the HR Committee as part of the Review Process, or if it is prepared in advance and delivered at the face-to-face meeting. Mark Jefferson clarified that the order would be as follows:

1. Face-to-Face meeting
2. Draft Report from the HR Committee
3. Review of HR Committee Report by the Library Director
4. Revised Report from the HR Committee

Saira Walker, DNV Manager, Human Resources was asked what the process is at the District. As Saira has just recently started in her position at the District, she offered to get back to the HR Committee on the DNV process.

Allison Rzen remarked that it would be very difficult to have a face-to-face meeting without anything written in advance to base comments on. Mark reviewed again that the face-to-face meeting between the HR Committee and the Library Director would be just a discussion, and then a written report would be produced by the HR Committee, which would be submitted to the Library Director for comment, then revised based on the Library Director's feedback and submitted

to the HR Committee to approve the document for recommendation to the Board, and then the document would be reviewed by the Board before receiving final approval.

Jacqueline van Dyk noted that the Library Director's closest working relationship is with the Chair of the Board, and wondered what weight that relationship should be given with respect to the other members of the Board. It was noted that at other libraries the review of the Director is often handled by the Chair of the Board directly, or through an Executive Committee. Mark noted that that is why David Porter (Board Chair) is part of the HR Committee. It was also noted that the Board Chair is not ex officio on the HR Committee. Allison felt that the review should not be conducted by the Chair alone, but that perhaps a sub-committee of the Chair of the Board, the Vice Chair, and the Chair of the HR Committee would be a good representation. Phil Webber suggested that it be spelled out in the Board Guidelines that the Board Chair will be part of the review process, and in fact that the review would not have any validity if the Board Chair was not consulted, because of the importance given to the working relationship between the Board Chair and the Library Director. This was generally agreed. Allison added that there should be open communication between the HR Committee, the Board Chair, and the Library Director on the matter of the Library Director's review. Allison wondered who would deliver the primary messaging of the review to the Library Director, and felt that it be most appropriately be the Board Chair that should deliver the message. Mark noted that the HR Committee makes its recommendation to the Board.

David Porter brought up the issue of the Stakeholder Review mentioned briefly by Allison Rzen earlier in the meeting. The main question would be around how the Library Director engages with stakeholders. He noted that this takes a long time to do anecdotally. Phil Webber reiterated Allison's earlier comment that a Stakeholder Review would not be completed annually. It was suggested it could take place every second year, and that perhaps a consultant could be hired to conduct a 360 degree rigorous and well-defined process. Jacqueline van Dyk wondered about the ethics at play around using such a process as an evaluative tool. Phil Webber suggested that the stakeholders would be selected based on who the Library Director was working with at the time. Allison Rzen questioned how a review could be conducted without discussions with Senior Staff, and felt that this feedback would be more valuable than feedback from stakeholders. Allison Rzen and David Porter strongly suggested that there was a need to be very thoughtful regarding the involvement of stakeholders in the Review of the Library Director, and that the answers to the questions Who? And Why? would be important considerations. It was also felt that it would be wasteful to make contact with a particular stakeholder solely for the purpose of soliciting feedback for the Library Director's review. Corinne McConchie asked whether Allison was thinking that there would be both an internal and external evaluations. Allison confirmed that she was indeed thinking that, but that the evaluations would need to remain vague. Mark stressed that the Stakeholder Review would be just a part of the entire review process, and that it should be considered just one of the tools in the review process. He added that the Library Director would review the Review, provide feedback on the development of the tool, and then the results would be fed into a personal growth plan. Jacqueline van Dyk questioned whether the Final Review would be delivered face-to-face. The response was not definitive. It was agreed that the full results of the discussion on BG-HR-10 would be captured by staff and distributed to the HR Committee for confirmation.

MOVED by Allison Rzen and SECONDED by David Porter

THAT the Board Guidelines BG-HR-10: Review of the Director of Library Services be revised to capture the evening's discussion and circulated to members of the HR Committee for final review within the next couple of days, and that, pending agreement with the revisions, that the HR Committee recommend that the Board Guidelines BG-HR-10 be presented to the Board for approval at the next Meeting of the Board. (HR-16-06-05)

MOTION CARRIED.

4.2 Updated Draft of Director Assessment Survey

The First Draft of the Director of Library Services Assessment Survey which was discussed at length at the last HR Committee meeting on March 23, 2016, was updated by Phil Webber based on feedback at that meeting, and a Second Draft of the Director of Library Services Assessment Survey distributed by e-mail to HR Committee Members for further comment later in the evening on March 23, 2016. No further comments were received from HR Committee Members. It was presented once again for final comments before being recommended to the Board for final approval. Phil Webber reviewed that changes to the Second Draft of the document.

The reason for changing the rating system in the First Draft, reducing it to 3 options instead of the 6 options that existed in the original West Vancouver Memorial Library document, was questioned. Allison Rzen responded that the idea was for respondents to make a strong commitment in to each point. Mark Jefferson emphasized that the survey was intended to be just one element of the Review, another tool, and that the results would then be fed into the Individual Development Plan (IDP). He said the survey results itself should not be regarded as a "report card".

In keeping with questions comparing the HR Committee version of the Assessment with the original West Vancouver Memorial Library document, Jacqueline van Dyk asked why the question about the Library Director's requirement to keep informed about library issues was removed, and by contrast, why a number of additional questions in the area of financial planning were added. She wondered how the Trustees would be able to know the level of detail asked in the survey regarding her involvement in the Library's financial matters. Saira confirmed that the Library Director is accountable for operating in a fiscally responsible manner within the approved budget and final budget approval is granted by the DNV. It was also noted that there were no questions regarding the delivery of the Library Director's Work Plan in the Assessment. Some minor changes to the document were agreed.

ACTION: Phil Webber to make agreed changes to the Second Draft of the Director of Library Services Assessment Survey, and send the final document to the HR Committee Members.

MOVED by Allison Rzen and SECONDED by David Porter

THAT the HR Committee recommend that this survey evaluation tool be presented to the Board for approval once amendments have been finalized. (HR-16-06-06)

MOTION CARRIED.

5. FOR INFORMATION

5.1 HR Guidelines Updates

Corinne McConchie reported that the Library received some suggested changes from CUPE regarding some of the newly revised NVDPL policies, and outlined the changes that were made as a result. The changes affected *MG-HR-01.0: Employee Code of Conduct*, and *MG-HR-01.6 Unpaid Leave of Absence*. Saira Walker clarified that the Collective Agreement does not address Unpaid Leave of Absence. Jacqueline van Dyk noted that the Library welcomes feedback from the Union, and is pleased to make suitable amendments where they support the Library's operations, policy, and the collective agreement. There was clarification that only Board Guidelines go to the Board for approval. Management Guidelines are not required to be reviewed and approved by the Board.

6. ADJOURN – 6:55 PM

MOVED by Mark Jefferson:

THAT the meeting be adjourned. (HR-16-06-07)

MOTION CARRIED.

HR Committee Chair — 10/03/16 **Date**

Director, Library Services — 3 Oct 2016 **Date**