



## CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE AGENDA

**ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE**  
**Brookens Administrative Center, Jennifer K. Putman Meeting Room**  
**1776 E. Washington, Urbana**  
**Tuesday, February 17, 2009 – 4:30 p.m.**

**MEMBERS:** Betz, McGinty, Moser

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
<b>I. CALL TO ORDER</b>	
<b>II. ROLL CALL</b>	
<b>III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDUM</b>	
<b>IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>	
a. February 5, 2009	1-5
b. February 11, 2009	6-9
<b>V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</b>	
<b>VI. CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT</b>	
a. Reaffirm Single County Administrator Structure	
b. Single County Administrator Hiring Procedure	
c. Closed Session Pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2 (c) 1 to Consider the Employment, Compensation, Discipline, Performance, or Dismissal of an Employee	
<b>VII. OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
<b>VIII. ADJOURNMENT</b>	

1 CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD  
2 COMMITTEE MINUTES  
3

---

4  
5 **ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE**

6 **Thursday, February 5, 2009**

7 **Meeting Room 3, Brookens Administrative Center**

8 **1776 E. Washington St., Urbana**

9  
10 6:00 p.m.

11  
12 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Betz, Brendan McGinty

13  
14 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Steve Moser

15  
16 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Carol Ammons (County Board Member), Kat Bork (Administrative  
17 Secretary), Deb Busey (County Administrator of Finance & HR  
18 Management), Amanda Tucker (HR Generalist), C. Pius Weibel (County  
19 Board Chair), Barbara Wysocki (County Board Member)

20  
21 **CALL TO ORDER**

22  
23 McGinty called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

24  
25 **ROLL CALL**

26  
27 Betz and McGinty were present, establishing the presence of a quorum.

28  
29 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDUM**

30  
31 **MOTION** by Betz to approve the agenda; seconded by McGinty. **Motion carried.**

32  
33 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

34  
35 There was no public participation.

36  
37 **DISCUSSION REGARDING CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

38  
39 McGinty reviewed the committee's discussions from last year's meetings. It was decided at  
40 that time to leave further development of the administrative structure until after the election and budget  
41 preparation. The County Board approved changing the structure from 2 County Administrators to a  
42 single County Administrator in October 2008. With the two County Administrators' contracts ending  
43 later this year, the committee had expressed a desire to have a new administrative structure in place by  
44 August. The committee talked about developing the job descriptions for a single County  
45 Administrator, a Director or Deputy Administrator of Facilities, and any other structure under the  
46 County Administrator. The committee wanted to have some transition to a new Facilities Director  
47 before the end of the current contracts and to have the Facilities Director start by October 1, 2009. At

48 least three months would be needed to advertise, interview, and fill the position. Another question is  
49 what the County will have with other positions down the road, such as the IT Director, HR, and  
50 Finance. The committee was going to look at the director-level position to decide what the County  
51 will have and set the job description that accompany the position. McGinty asked if this summary was  
52 accurate and Betz confirmed this was close to his recollection. Betz recommended submitting the  
53 resolution approving the single County Administrator structure that was passed in October to the  
54 County Board again to get everyone up to speed on the issue and reaffirm support for the structure.  
55 McGinty asked if this committee should bring that recommendation to the Policy, Personnel, &  
56 Appointments Committee to go to the full Board in February. Betz agreed and did not think  
57 reaffirming the single Administrator structure would be a problem because it was unanimously  
58 approved by the County Board in October. McGinty concurred and recommended providing the past  
59 Administrative Structure Committee minutes to bring Board members up to speed on the previous  
60 discussions. Regarding a Director of Facilities, the committee discussed whether the person should be  
61 an engineer, architect, or a facilities manager and McGinty recalled the committee leaned more  
62 towards a facilities manager-type person. Betz agreed and noted that employing an architect or  
63 engineer was out of the question financially and was not necessary for the position. His problem with  
64 developing the position is his ignorance with what skill set is needed. Betz asked what a Facilities  
65 Director was supposed to do in relation to supervising the management of County buildings, upkeep,  
66 maintenance, and potential expansion. The County will have major facilities issues coming up in the  
67 future and changing maintenance issues. McGinty asked for Busey's opinion. Busey thought there  
68 was a degree in building management and the County needs someone who could develop a capital  
69 improvement plan for all 11 facilities. The initial documentation of this plan may take the expertise of  
70 an architect or engineer, but once it is documented the Director of Facilities would need to ensure the  
71 plan is adhered to, properly budgeted for, and that maintenance is appropriated in a timely manner.  
72 This should all be managed by the Director of Facilities. Betz asked if the building management  
73 degree was a graduate degree. Busey confirmed she would check on it and that there was a level of  
74 expertise that is not to the level of an architect or engineer. Betz asked if other counties with the  
75 facilities manager position employ someone with this type of degree. Busey said it is a desired  
76 standard, but the degree is rather new and most counties probably have someone in that type of  
77 position who has been there for a long time. The County would look for commensurate experience.

78  
79 McGinty asked if the County Board endorsed the organizational chart when they affirmed the  
80 single Administrator position. Betz said the Board did not and he believed that he and Moser were not  
81 prepared to endorse it. Betz wanted to have the skill set and financial impact described. McGinty said  
82 he meant to bring the organizational chart back to fill it in. Betz agreed and said some price tag range  
83 needs to be included, especially given the financial situation of the County. Busey said that  
84 information could be quickly provided. McGinty asked if bringing the organizational chart back could  
85 be a goal for the next meeting to start defining the positions and exploring the financial impact of  
86 going from 2 Administrators to 1 Administrator and a Director of Facilities. Betz asked if the County  
87 had a Director of HR now. Busey answered no and explained the County does have an HR Division.  
88 The County Board has named the County Administrator of Finance & HR Management as its  
89 Personnel Director, so the HR staff answers to that Administrator. Busey confirmed this structure is  
90 working well and she did not believe the County needed a director-level position for HR.

91  
92 Busey suggested the committee consider separating the IT Division away from the  
93 Administrative Services Department and isolating those expenses into a separate department. There is

94 already an IT Director and an IT staff. The Administrative Services would consist of the County  
95 Board and overall County department support, including HR and purchasing. McGinty asked what a  
96 similar separate department would be to an IT Department. Busey said that Physical Plant is already a  
97 separate department. Physical Plant is considered part of Administrative Services and she thought it  
98 really should be a separate department responsible for all the buildings and building maintenance. The  
99 IT Director would report to the County Administrator. Busey explained all of the IT expenses are in  
100 the Administrative Services budget and she thought it would be a much cleaner accounting of the true IT  
101 costs for the County if it is separated from Administrative Services. McGinty agreed because IT is not  
102 a revenue-generating department and it would be a way to track the sort of support an organization the  
103 size of Champaign County requires. McGinty asked if any other department was in that category.  
104 Busey thought that Administrative Services was generally providing direct support services to the  
105 County Board and general services to all County departments, such as HR, purchasing, photocopying,  
106 phones, etc. from one central place. McGinty has gathered there is some sort of animosity from some  
107 departments to Administrative Services and asked for a couple of examples why this exists and if there  
108 was a way to alleviate concerns through restructuring. Betz thought it was related to elected officials, not  
109 departments. The elected officials see themselves as constitutional officers and they resent any attempt  
110 to control or mediate their budgets, personnel policies, or department operations even though the  
111 County Board gets the bill whenever there is a problem. The County Board has very little authority  
112 over the elected offices other than the purse strings. Betz sees it as dynamic tension that people  
113 become invested in. McGinty asked if it would just continue to exist because of the status. Betz  
114 indicated that part of it was personality and part of it was structure. Betz said one of the most  
115 frustrating things of being on the County Board was having the responsibility but none of the actual  
116 authority when it comes to the structure of Champaign County with its appointed and elected officials.  
117 Ammons asked if revenue generated by the elected offices came back to the General Corporate Fund.  
118 Busey confirmed that all revenues for all General Corporate offices go to the General Corporate Fund.  
119 Ammons said it appeared the County Board only has leverage through the budget. Busey agreed with  
120 Betz and mentioned that, with the County having two isolated campuses, there is a perception that  
121 Administrative Services and its employees get preferential treatment because they are closer to the  
122 County Board. Busey did not think this was true, but you cannot stop a perception that chooses to  
123 perpetuate itself. Other departments think there are many staff in Administrative Services, but  
124 Champaign does not have too many Administrative Services staff by comparison to other counties its  
125 size. It is just that there are a lot of services focused in the one department, such as payroll and  
126 benefits administration. Administrative Services does not have very many clerical positions and Busey  
127 hears from offices that are primarily composed of clerical positions that Administrative Services  
128 employees are well paid. This is because it is a different kind of responsibility held by the  
129 Administrative Services employees. The perception is not accurate, but it exists that the County gives  
130 the County Administrators anything they ask for. McGinty stated the County Board is random enough  
131 that they could not play favorites like that.

132  
133 Weibel entered the meeting at 6:24 p.m.

134  
135 McGinty asked Tucker about the job descriptions for like positions of a Director of Facilities  
136 from comparable counties. Tucker said they pulled descriptions from Sangamon, McLean, and Peoria  
137 Counties. McGinty requested for those materials to be provided to the committee before the next  
138 meeting to allow the committee to do some legwork to come to the next meeting with some draft  
139 position descriptions for the County Administrator and Facilities Director. These positions could be fit

140 into the organization, including knowing the compensation ranges. McGinty would like the committee  
141 to review this information before just seeing it in the next meeting. Busey said it could be sent out  
142 with the agenda a next ahead of time. McGinty asked how Betz, as the Policy Committee Chair,  
143 would recommend moving forward, for example taking a piece at a time. Betz said the problem is that  
144 it is unprecedented. The last time the County Board hired the two Administrators, it was not a logical,  
145 methodical process. McGinty asked how the former process could be improved. He suggested the  
146 Administrative Structure Committee should put together an organizational chart, position descriptions,  
147 and salary ranges to take to the Policy, Personnel, & Appointments Committee. Betz recommended  
148 this committee bring the whole package to the Policy Committee and then vet it out in Policy to see if  
149 there are slight changes. He wants to be able to present a package that people had enough input into so  
150 the County Board feels comfortable voting on an administrative structure resolution.  
151

152 McGinty questioned if the only thing the County Board should reaffirm was the idea of  
153 changing to a single County Administrator. There is a question about whether there would be a search  
154 to fill the County Administrator position and how that would be conducted. Betz thought the County  
155 Board needed to reaffirm the single Administrator structure with the new Board so it is in agreement.  
156 He felt filling the position was a totally separate issue. Weibel and McGinty agreed. McGinty  
157 suggested the next task after the reaffirmation would be showing a structure with a single  
158 Administrator, a Director of Facilities, and the changes that would occur. He suggested showing how  
159 Administrative Services would be restructured, the positions descriptions, and the costs involved.  
160 Once the County Board approves that structure, then they could look for who would fill those slots.  
161

162 Ammons wanted it to be made clear that agreeing to Step 1 of the process is not agreeing to  
163 Step 2 or 3. She wanted to reaffirm along the way that the County Board has not promised anyone  
164 anything, they are simply working on the structure at this point. Betz said implementation is the third  
165 step. McGinty said his only concern was getting there rapidly enough to have enough time to post  
166 positions and fill them. Betz said the reaffirmation resolution should be submitted at March cycle of  
167 meetings. Ammons suggested a timeline be designed to accompany the reaffirmation resolution.  
168

169 Weibel asked if it would be worthwhile to look at the Supervisor of Building Maintenance job  
170 description because it could be affected. Busey suggested it is an opportune time to review the overall  
171 structure of Physical Plant because there are two supervisors: the Supervisor of Building Maintenance  
172 and Supervisor of Ground Maintenance, who both answer directly to the County Administrator of  
173 Facilities & Procurement. Ammons asked if there are any other departments where the County has  
174 two people operating in a similar situation. Busey said their staff are defined differently and  
175 mentioned the County Clerk's Office and State's Attorney's Office have more than one supervisor  
176 over different areas of responsibility. It is also a structure that the County has morphed into over the  
177 years, so it is a good time to review to see if it the most effective structure.  
178

179 Betz asked how the Nursing Home Administrator fit into the structure because that person is no  
180 longer an appointed position. Busey said the County Board may want to consider that in many other  
181 counties' administrative structures the appointed officials are evaluated and report to the County  
182 Administrator even if they are hired by the County Board. The Animal Control Director has already  
183 been placed underneath the County Administrator. The other positions reporting to the County  
184 Administrator would potentially include the Nursing Home Administrator, the EMA Director, and the  
185 Planning & Zoning Director. This would take the County Board out of total responsibility for the

186 annual performance evaluations of appointed officials even though the Board members might still  
187 participate in the process. In both Peoria and McLean Counties, the County Administrators are  
188 responsible for those duties. Betz raised the issue because the Nursing Home structure with its  
189 management contract is odd right now. McGinty interjected that the County Board evaluates the  
190 performance for how the management firm is doing. Betz noted the Supervisor of Assessments is a  
191 constitutional officer and wondered how other counties address this situation. Busey said the County  
192 Board currently has the Supervisor of Assessments evaluated by a performance appraisal team just like  
193 the other appointed officials. She thought the Supervisor could refuse to participate in the process.  
194 Weibel said there some proposed legislation to modify that somewhat. Betz was raising these issues  
195 because the committee needs to think beyond facilities to other areas. Busey asked if the committee  
196 wanted the County Board to affirm the responsibilities expected of the County Administrator when it  
197 reaffirms the single Administrator structure. The committee agreed. Busey suggested spelling that out  
198 in a job description, which was not done in October, to accompany the reaffirmation resolution. Betz  
199 thought there were some responsibilities in the resolution. McGinty offered to work with Busey to put  
200 together some job descriptions and concepts of how the structure would work for the committee to  
201 consider before the next meeting and to be submitted to the Policy Committee and County Board in  
202 March. Betz agreed. McGinty said the conversation about how the County would afford a changed  
203 structure would have to be held after the structure is developed. Betz said the word "reaffirmation"  
204 should be used in the resolution so the County Board recalls that it has been approved before.  
205

206 The committee discussed when to hold its next meeting and selected February 11, 2009 at 5:00  
207 p.m. as its next meeting.  
208

209 **OTHER BUSINESS**

210  
211 There was no other business.  
212

213 **ADJOURNMENT**

214  
215 Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.  
216

217 Respectfully submitted,

218  
219 Kat Bork

220 Administrative Secretary  
221

222 *Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.*

1 CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD  
2 **COMMITTEE MINUTES**

---

3  
4  
5 **ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE**

6 **Wednesday, February 11, 2009**

7 **Jennifer K. Putman Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center**

8 **1776 E. Washington St., Urbana**

9  
10 5:00 p.m.

11  
12 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Betz, Brendan McGinty

13  
14 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Steve Moser

15  
16 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Kat Bork (Administrative Secretary), Deb Busey (County Administrator  
17 of Finance & HR Management), Amanda Tucker (HR Generalist),  
18 C. Pius Weibel (County Board Chair)

19  
20 **CALL TO ORDER**

21  
22 McGinty called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

23  
24 **ROLL CALL**

25  
26 Betz and McGinty were present, establishing the presence of a quorum.

27  
28 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDUM**

29  
30 **MOTION** by Betz to approve the agenda; seconded by McGinty. **Motion carried.**

31  
32 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

33  
34 There was no public participation.

35  
36 **CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT**

37  
38 The committee had received the materials it requested at the last meeting via email before the  
39 meeting. McGinty and Betz discussed the timeline for moving forward with reaffirming a single  
40 County Administrator structure at the March County Board meeting. McGinty suggested it would be  
41 best to determine if the County would perform a search or look at an internal promotion for the County  
42 Administrator position. The County has a policy on how to fill a vacant position that allows for a  
43 couple of options. He recommended the committee reconvene before the March Policy, Personnel, &  
44 Appointments Committee meeting to discuss the issue with Moser and perhaps have a closed session.  
45 Busey confirmed Moser would be back in town next week. Betz questioned the closed session because  
46 the decision on whether or not to conduct a search should be made in open session because it is a  
47 policy issue. He asked for an opinion on this matter. Busey said the County Board has two options

48 under its policy, either to promote a County employee and not do a search or to perform a search. The  
49 closed session would necessary if the committee was going to have a discussion about an internal  
50 candidate. The way the policy is written the Policy, Personnel, & Appointments Committee makes  
51 that determination and forwards a recommendation to the County Board because it is the parent  
52 committee in this instance. The Administrative Structure Committee would make a recommendation  
53 to the Policy Committee. Betz stated the question of whether the committee will recommend having a  
54 search for the County Administrator position is a decision for an open session as a policy issue,  
55 without talking about the merits of any individual candidates. While he has an opinion on the issue  
56 based on the last time the County performed a County Administrator search, he did not want to  
57 preclude anyone else's viewpoint and thought there would be some division at the Policy Committee.  
58 The committee discussed the procedure further and agreed the discussion about whether to conduct a  
59 search or promote a candidate from within the County would be during the open session at the next  
60 meeting. They agreed to place a closed session on the next meeting agenda so the committee could  
61 discuss an internal candidate if they decided to promote from within. McGinty and Betz agreed it  
62 would be important to have Moser involved in the discussion at the next meeting. McGinty asked that  
63 all the committee minutes be sent to Moser so he could be brought up-to-date on the committee's  
64 progress.  
65

66 McGinty spoke about how much time would be needed to perform a search for the County  
67 Administrator position and Facilities Director position. There has been discussion about having a  
68 Director of Facilities selected by September before a start date of December 1, 2008. Betz assumed  
69 the single County Administrator position would be filled fairly soon and the decisions regarding the  
70 sub-positions, including the Facilities Director, would be made by the County Administrator. Unless  
71 the County Administrator wanted to have a search committee or an advisory committee, he did not  
72 anticipate this committee or the County Board being intimately involved in that decision other than  
73 setting the salary ranges. McGinty agreed with this approach. Busey confirmed that procedure would  
74 be consistent with the way the IT Director was developed and hired. McGinty asked how the structural  
75 changes would affect the current contracts of the two County Administrators, because he thought the  
76 County Board would have to wait until the contracts expired to make changes. Betz stated that the  
77 parties in a contract can mutually agree to reform that contract at any time during the contract term.  
78 Hypothetically, the parties could agree to new positions and the old contracts would be extinguished or  
79 one of the two contracts could be changed and the other would be allowed to run its course until the  
80 end of its term. McGinty said they could hypothetically hire a single County Administrator and this  
81 person would be expected/empowered to establish the structure underneath his/her position. Betz said  
82 he presumed that is what the committee had decided. He noted that the County Board was not  
83 involved in the search when the Deputy County Administrator/HR was hired though some Board  
84 members participated in the process. Another example is that a school superintendent does not obtain  
85 approval from a school board whenever teacher positions are filled as long as the changes adhere to the  
86 budget. Betz envisioned the County Board taking on more of a policy role in general with a single  
87 Administrator structure. The County Board approves the policies and then has an Administrator to  
88 execute them. Betz did not see the County Board being involved in the hiring or firing of various  
89 positions other than in an advisory role and McGinty agreed. Betz did not think everyone on the  
90 County Board would agree, but that would be a discussion for the Policy, Personnel, & Appointments  
91 Committee and the County Board. The committee discussed holding a meeting next week and when  
92 Moser would be in town.  
93



94 Betz asked about the County Administrator's job description. Busey noted the job description  
95 was provided in the packet of information, which is basically defined by the ordinance and by statutory  
96 language. She encouraged the committee to look at the McLean County and Peoria County  
97 organization charts because that is where comparable counties with single Administrators differ from  
98 Champaign County. Betz stated they need to have people invested in the organization. He commented  
99 on how County Board standing committees conduct the performance appraisals of appointed officials  
100 although they do not work with those individuals on a daily basis. He felt it would be more correct to  
101 set a policy wherein the County Administrator would conduct the performance appraisals of the  
102 appointed officials instead of the County Board members. McGinty said the County Board could  
103 become involved if an official's performance review rating was very low to help determine whether  
104 something needs to happen from a discipline or dismissal standpoint. Betz disagreed because he  
105 thought that is what the County hires an Administrator to do. If an employee's performance is lacking  
106 then the County Administrator fixes the situation. Any issue about performance or staffing should be  
107 taken up with County Administrator; Betz wants to get the County Board out of the day-to-day process  
108 of dealing with employment, retention, and non-retention issues. Betz did not think the County Board  
109 was competent to do this business because they do not work with the employees all day, every day. He  
110 sees the County Board's only really retention issue as being with the County Administrator. McGinty  
111 strongly supported this approach. McGinty listed the goals for next meeting to have open and closed  
112 discussions to affirm a single Administrator, whether to do a search or look to hire internally, and enter  
113 into a closed session to talk about an internal hire. The committee's decision would then be forwarded  
114 to the Policy, Personnel, & Appointments Committee in March. Betz agreed with this approach.  
115

116 Weibel entered the meeting at 5:16 p.m.  
117

118 McGinty explained to Weibel that the committee wanted Moser to be present to complete the  
119 process of fair analysis and reviewed what the committee has discussed at this meeting. Weibel asked  
120 if the current structure had both the head of grounds and the head of maintenance in Physical Plant  
121 reporting to the County Administrator of Facilities & Procurement. Busey answered yes. Betz said he  
122 sees the hiring and firing of any sub-administrators to be the Administrator's job. McGinty said the  
123 organization of a facilities department would be something for the County Administrator to work on.  
124 Busey said the Administrator would ultimately bring it to the County Board for approval in terms of  
125 defining the positions and classifications. The actual incumbents who are in the positions would be  
126 left to the discretion of the Administrator. Betz stated the Board needs to realize the structure would  
127 evolve and positions could be changed based on the County's needs. The Administrator should be free  
128 to bring changes to the County Board.  
129

130 The committee discussed setting a date for its next meeting when all the members could attend.  
131 It was determined the next meeting would be held on February 17, 2009 at 4:30 p.m. before the  
132 Democrat Caucus.  
133

#### 134 **OTHER BUSINESS**

135  
136 There was no other business.  
137  
138  
139

140 **ADJOURNMENT**

141

142 Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

143

144 Respectfully submitted,

145

146 Kat Bork

147 Administrative Secretary

148

149 *Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.*