

Position History Summary

The Chief Services Officer (CSO) position was initially created in May 2001 as a Deputy Director of Human Service. While the job was posted and several applicants were interviewed by the previous Board of Commissioners (Thibault, Shaub, Ford), the position was never filled. Funding for the position was included in the 2004 budget at the request of the incoming Board of Commissioners (Shaub, Shellenberger, Henderson).

The Commissioners reviewed and approved an updated CSO job description and the County's Human Resources (HR) department posted the vacancy on January 13, 2004. The posted description made the position accountable for the County's CYA, MH/MR, Office of Aging, Drug and Alcohol and YIC departments. In 2003 these 5 departments had a combined staff of approximately 475 and total budgets near \$92 million. Additionally, the CSO was responsible for partnering with the Housing and Redevelopment Authority to administer the Human Services Development Fund (HSDF). The posted salary range was \$70,000 to \$105,000.

Advertisements were placed in area newspapers, web based job posting sites and PA and national County newsletters resulting in over 100 applications.

Gary Heinke (GH) was selected from the 3 candidates that were interviewed. He was hired with an unanimous vote by the Board of Commissioners on Wednesday, March 24, 2004. His starting salary of \$80,000 was approved by Salary Board on March 8, 2004.

Conestoga View, the Prison, Human Relations Commission, LETA, Veterans Services and Public Defender's Office were removed from the Chief Administrative Officer's (CAO) oversight to the CSO's shortly after GH was hired. The change made the CSO responsible for 11 departments with a combined office staff near 1450 (200% increase) and budgets totaling over \$145 million (58% increase). Oversight of the Public Defender was returned to the CAO in 2005.

On April 14, 2004, I¹ cautioned the Board about changing the scope of the job so soon after filling the position. I was concerned that the change could affect the HSDF funding for the position and could give potential applicants with experience in health care or prison settings who had not applied for the CSO position grounds to file legal complaints. The Board kept CV, the Prison and the other departments under the direction of the CSO.

Heinke resigned in October 2005.

Position description review

In Nov/Dec 2003, I met with Shellenberger, Shaub and HR staff from Armstrong Industries to discuss the CAO and CSO positions. The Armstrong corporate staff was already familiar with the County's organizational structure and re-organization that Shellenberger and Shaub

¹ Throughout the document "I" refers to Tom Myers, County Human Resource Director and "we" refers to Joe Hofmann, attorney with Stevens and Lee, and Tom Myers.

were considering. At the meeting, I reviewed the County's typical recruitment and posting procedures. I agreed to update the County Administrator's (CAO) and Deputy Director of Human Services (CSO) job descriptions to reflect the reorganization Shaub and Shellenberger discussed. We also talked about methods to recruit experienced business administrators to the County. It was clear to me from these discussions that Shellenberger anticipated active involvement with the CSO and Shaub with the CAO.

The updated CSO job description was reviewed by the Commissioners (Shaub, Shellenberger, Henderson) and on January 13, 2004 the position was posted in-house. Deadline for applying was February 23, 2004.

Recruitment activities for the CSO position

Bonnie Ashworth (BLA), Personnel Specialist in the County's Human Resources (HR) department, was assigned to coordinate the recruitment, selection, hiring and background checking process. She was to follow procedures typically used to fill County vacancies although the position was advertised more extensively than normal. Announcements appeared in surrounding newspapers, three national job search websites, the PA CareerLink, and in the NACo County News.

The County received Mr. Heinke's resume and cover letter dated January 13, 2004 the morning of January 16, 2004. In total the HR department received over 100 applications before the February 23, 2004 deadline.

Interview process

HR did not recommend GH for an interview. Ms. Ashworth sorted the applicants based on the information submitted by the applicants into three categories: "A" - highly qualified, potential interview candidates, "B" - qualified, but with limited recent or related experience, interview if limited success with "A" applicants and "C" - marginally or not qualified. A total of 20 candidates were rated "A", 15 as "B" and 70 as "C". I also reviewed the "A" and "B" applicants and concurred with her ratings. Mr. Heinke was rated "B" because HR believed his most recent experiences, an intern with the Pillager SD and self-employed consultant, were not at a level to be considered relevant experience for the CSO position. ✓

Information on the twenty (20) category "A" applicants was given to the three (3) Commissioners on February 24, 2004. Commissioner Shellenberger requested and was given all the applications. Subsequently, Commissioner Shellenberger requested that GH be considered for an interview (to be moved to the "A" category) and information on GH was distributed to Commissioner Shaub and Henderson.

The Commissioners individually chose their top candidates and met on Feb. 27, 2004 to determine who would be interviewed. At least 6 different candidates were identified by the Board. GH was initially picked by 2 Commissioners (Shaub and Shellenberger) and was one of the four selected for interviews. While BLA provided support at the meeting she did not vote.

Summary of the education and work background of the other 3 candidates

Candidate A B.A. in Philosophy – Mt. St. Mary's College
M.A. in Public Health – University of Pittsburgh
M.A. in History/Theology – Mt. St. Mary's College
Doctoral candidate, Medical Ethics - Duquesne University.

18 yr in director or manager level positions in marketing, business development and customer outreach in various business

2 yr as supervisor in program for the Aging
2 yr as associate pastor

Candidate B B.S. with major in Sociology – Univ. of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
Master of Social Work – Univ. of Minnesota-Duluth

6 yr as director of a WI County agency that coordinated co-operated/contracted services for MH developmental disability and chemical dependency service, including a 65 bed inpatient facility.

25 yr in executive level experience with various employers in human and social service agencies

Candidate C B.S. with major in Psychology – York College
Masters in Governmental Administration – Univ. of Pennsylvania
Doctor of Education - Temple

10 yr with executive level positions (publicly traded) for-profit company providing alternative education, community-based corrections, rehabilitation and treatment of youth and adults.

8 yr as Executive Director of a PA county youth center

BLA contacted the selected candidates and scheduled interviews for March 1 and 2, 2004. GH was scheduled for the second day. All agreed to interview, but one applicant (Candidate "C") withdrew shortly before the scheduled interview and was not interviewed.

An initial set of interview questions was developed by BLA using her knowledge of the CSO position and the human services departments. Her familiarity with discrimination law and interviewing techniques taught in the County's successful supervisor training was helpful.

The Commissioners reviewed, revised and suggested several questions prior to the interviews. A packet that included a brief summary of the applicant's work history and education, information supplied by the applicant and the updated interview questions was

prepared by BLA and distributed to the Commissioners several days before the scheduled interviews.

The interviews were conducted in the Commissioners' conference room. BLA reminded the Board to avoid discriminatory or non-job related inquiries of the applicants. Prior to bringing each applicant into the room, BLA spent a few minutes reviewing with the Board the applicant's background. BLA was familiar with GH's inconsistent use of job titles describing his activities at the Pillager School District. She pointed out prior to the interview that GH's last position was an internship.

BLA led the actual interviews by asking each applicant the agreed to questions. The Board then asked follow-up questions. Each interview lasted about an hour. The Board was encouraged to take notes during the interview. The interview notes were retained by the Commissioners. Comm. Shaub kept his notes. Comm. Henderson's and Shellenberger's are no longer available.

Selection process

After the last interview the board briefly discussed the candidates and agreed to meet the following day to determine if any of the candidates would be offered the position. The Board decided not to interview other applicants. According to BLA there was general agreement that GH interviewed the best. He was well prepared and answered all the questions thoroughly and articulately. This was noticeably different from others who were unsettled by a question or two. It was apparent that he had done an extensive review of Lanc. County government and this position. He mentioned during the interview he had talked with several of the department heads that the CSO would supervise.

Initially, Commissioners Shaub and Shellenberger rated GH as their top candidate; Commissioner Henderson rated him second. However, the Board agreed unanimously to offer the position to Heinke.

Unstated involvement with Heinke

Neither GH nor Shellenberger mentioned that Shellenberger had contacted him about the opening or that he and Shellenberger had a previous relationship. This was when GH worked at Marketplace Ministries, Inc (MMI) and Shellenberger at Kreiders. Neither did Heinke, Shellenberger or Shaub mention they had met and discussed the position before the opening was posted. GH did not mention that he met with and received general information about county government law from Lancaster County solicitor John Espenshade in the summer/fall of 2003.

At no time during the interview or subsequent hiring discussions did Shellenberger or Shaub acknowledge that they were familiar with or had provided GH with information about the position or the County before the position was posted.

HR's first contact with GH was receipt of his letter dated 1/13/04 applying for the CSO posted that same day. Neither Shellenberger nor GH told BLA of their past association. She discerned that GH and Shellenberger may have known each other when his out-of-state resume was one of the first received and Shellenberger asked her to move GH to the "A" group.

On October 26, 2005, Shaub delivered to HR a copy of a cover letter and resume from GH dated May 27, 2003 and addressed to Shellenberger at his home address. The letter was apparently filed in Shaub's personal files in the Comm's office since the summer/fall 2003. The letter and resume are distinctive in that they are printed on the back of a letter from the Shellenberger primary campaign and contain handwritten notes. Phrases that identify skills related to county government are highlighted. Shaub explained that the letter/resume was given to him by Shellenberger and the notes were Shaub's.

The letter was brought to Shaub's attention when he asked staff for information concerning GH. The May 27, 2003 cover letter included highlights of GH's background and indicates his interest in the Director of Human Services or the County Administrator position. The context of the letter suggests it is a follow-up to earlier discussion(s) or correspondence with Shellenberger about working for the County. The letter included a resume that is different from the one submitted 1/13/04 and used during the hiring process.

The Penn State career service center, like many other resume writing resources identifies the resume as "a brief 'advertisement' of your skills, knowledge, and relevant experience ... It should be specific to each type of job you are seeking". Mr. Heinke undoubtedly understood and utilized this concept when he prepared the resume he submitted in response to the CSO position when it was advertised in January 2004. The resume submitted in response to the advertisement adds details about his experience at Pillager School District, expands his managerial and administrative roles at MMI and in the military, deemphasizes local church involvement and adds several new experiences. The differences are shown in a side-by-side comparison accompanying the report.

As a result of receiving a copy of the May 27, 2003 cover letter and resume, Joe Hofmann, attorney with Stevens and Lee, and I questioned each Commissioner during the week of Oct 31, 2005 to understand their involvement with or awareness of GH before he interviewed with the Board.

- Henderson information

Commissioner Henderson stated she had no prior knowledge of or contact with GH before she saw his resume and participated in the interview with him.

- Shellenberger information

Shellenberger states he initially met GH while he worked at Kreider's and GH worked at MMI. They had a successful working relationship. He learned about GH's military experience through causal conversation. He believed GH would be a good candidate for the

CSO position. He recalls arranging a meeting to introducing GH to Shaub and to John Espenshade, County solicitor, sometime between the 2003 primary and general elections. They met at Shellenberger's restaurant.

Shellenberger recalls receiving a fax or email with the 5/27/03 letter/resume at the restaurant, but does not remember any specifics about the letter or resume. He denies that he counseled GH to make changes that might make the resume more attractive to the County and states that he never compared the two resumes. He was not aware (prior to the newspaper articles) that the 1/13/04 resume was inaccurate or different from the 5/27/03 resume.

- Shaub information

Shaub recalls Shellenberger describing GH as a 'first rate' candidate and accepted Shellenberger invitation to meet GH the morning of September 5, 2003 at Shellenberger's restaurant, The Eatery. He believes he faxed GH information about the County and Shaub/Shellenberger's anticipated re-organization in advance of the Sept 5, 2003 meeting.

Shaub does not recall talking with or providing GH additional information or feedback after the meeting. He later told Shellenberger he thought GH was a good candidate, that the CAO/CSO were important positions and the Board needed to hire the best. GH was the only candidate Shellenberger discussed with Shaub.

At some point between the 2003 primary and general election Shellenberger gave Shaub a copy of the May 27, 2003 letter/resume sent by GH to Shellenberger. Shaub doesn't remember if he wrote the notes on the 5/27/03 documents during his 9/5/03 meeting with GH or at another time. He doesn't recall specifically discussing the information referenced by his notes with Heinke or making any suggestion to Heinke about the resume.

Shaub stated he gave the letter and resume to staff to file and forgot about them until staff gave them to him on October 10, 2005. He did not compare the 1/13/04 and 5/27/03 resumes during the selection process in February and March 2004.

- John Espenshade information

John Espenshade was asked by Shellenberger to meet with GH and did so on September 5, 2003 at The Eatery.² John talked to GH and provided him information about the workings of County government under Pennsylvania law. He later sent GH pamphlets published by the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development, as well as an outline of the County Code.

² Shaub and Shellenberger had asked Espenshade to work with them on transition issues before the general election. Espenshade stated he sought and received approval from then-chairman Paul Thibault for these transition meetings. The County was not charged for Espenshade's time for the transition meetings, including the meeting with Heinke on September 5.

After the meeting at The Eatery, GH e-mailed Shellenberger, Shaub, and Espenshade on seven occasions that we were able to determine. He sent e-mails to Espenshade on September 9, September 19, and September 29. He sent e-mails to Shaub, Shellenberger, and Espenshade on October 21, October 27, November 25, and December 17. One of the e-mails sent to Shaub was sent to his county address and the other three were sent to a home e-mail address. All the e-mails to Shellenberger were sent to a home e-mail address. In a September 9, 2003 e-mail to Espenshade, GH asked to be sent reading material "regarding the County Court System and court personnel relationships as well as county insurance information." In a September 19, 2003 e-mail he thanked Espenshade for the materials sent and stated "Any suggestions on my resume from your perspective (other than deleting any finance/budget experience numbers) would be welcome." GH also stated in the September 19 e-mail "I also keep Dick informed via land line." Espenshade responded by telling GH that he would send another package of materials. Espenshade made brief responses to most of the GH e-mails but never responded to or addressed GH's request for suggestions on his resume. The remainder of the e-mails was personal or involved reports by GH of his activities in Minnesota and/or good wishes/congratulations regarding the election campaign.

Neither Shellenberger nor Shaub asked Espenshade for his opinion about GH and nobody asked Espenshade to assist GH with his resume. Espenshade was later asked to provide similar to other officials after they were hired, not before as with GH.

As noted elsewhere, we were unable to determine what, if any responses to GH's e-mails were made by Shellenberger or Shaub because the e-mails sent to Shaub's County address were not archived. Further, we did not have access to the home e-mail addresses mailboxes.

County phone records confirm a fax was sent to GH on 9/2/03 at 1:24 p.m. which was likely the information Shaub sent to GH in advance of their meeting. Additionally, phone records show a short call from the HR department to GH's Minnesota phone on 2/17/04 at 9:21 a.m.. BLA believes she called GH around this date after she received an unsolicited call from GH.

Phone records also list a 32 minute call on 2/27/04 at 11:37 a.m. from the Commissioners' office to GH's MN phone. The call was placed from a line assigned to what was then a vacant office. February 27 was the date the Board selected which applicants would receive an interview. None of the Commissioners or the Commissioners' office staff remember placing this call or contacting GH around this time. BLA states she e-mailed GH on this date to schedule the interview and never contacted GH using a Commissioners' office phone.

County records for land (includes fax) and cell phones show no additional calls to GH's Minn. home phone number between April 2003 and March 2, 2004 (date of his interview). County emails for this same period were apparently not archived and are no longer available on County computers. Several calls were placed after the interview, but before GH started.

After GH's resignation, Joe Hofmann requested through GH's attorney, Elvin Kraybill, that GH respond to questions related to communications about his prospective County employment that he had between the 2003 primary election and his interview. The request

was denied. In declining the request on behalf of GH, Mr. Kraybill stated that it appeared to him and GH that the proposed questions were being asked in the context of "larger political issues in the County," directed beyond GH. He further stated, "given the divisive political atmosphere in county government it just does not seem to be in GH's interest to have further dialogue" on these topics.

Heinke's Background and HR's background check

The HR office had GH's cover letter dated 1/13/04, resume, and County application prior to the interview. Since HR did not have the earlier 5/27/03 resume until recently, the hiring process did not involve consideration of this information or the changes between the two resumes.

BLA understood GH's position with the MN school district to be part of an internship and underlined "Post Graduate Administrative Internship" on the resume included in the packet prepared for the interview. Additionally she commented on the internship to the three Commissioners just prior to the GH interview.

After GH accepted the position the department collected and reviewed additional information including his transcripts, a credit check and a criminal background check by the DA's office. BLA was assigned to confirm his relevant educational background and work experience.

She obtained copies of transcripts for each post-high school institution listed on the resume; requested a credit check from the local Credit Bureau, and requested a criminal background check through the DA's office. The credit report and criminal background check revealed no problems.

When BLA received the transcripts on 3/8/04 she recognized the educational information listed on the resume and application as representative of his earned degrees and the major course associated with the degree with one exception. The degrees and major course work in the resume parallel the transcripts, except one. The resume lists his major course work at Bethel Theological Seminary as "Pastoral Ministries, Human Resource Development". Pastoral Ministries is appropriate, but Human Resource Development is a questionable assertion because there does not to be any identified course listed on the transcript that would have included education or training on that topic. GH's employment application lists only "HR Development" as the course of study which is an inaccurate characterization.

While not the more typical resume format, the information, except as noted above, reflected the transcripts and BLA therefore did not bring this to anyone's attention.

When questioned before his resignation by Hofmann/Myers on the structure of the resume, GH stated he listed the general degree level (i.e. Master or Doctorate) followed by a brief description of the major course work. He offered a limited defense of the HR Development description of his Bethel degree. His comments reflect the conclusions that BLA previously made.

Additionally, GH stated that his internship at Pillager was done in conjunction with his course work at St. Cloud State University. He explained that "Asst superintendent" was descriptive of the level and type of work he did while an intern. This was consistent with BLA's understanding at the time of the interview and with the reference provided by the school district superintendent. On his employment application, GH listed "Asst superintendent" without stating it was an internship. This is a misrepresentation of his volunteer (unpaid) activities.

Also he stated that during the time that he was serving the administrative internship he also was a paid substitute educational aide for the Minnesota Learning Center, Central Minnesota Juvenile Detention Center and the Pillager SD. He told Hofmann and Myers that this work helped him to earn his state administrator license.

The Trinity transcript shows that GH obtained a "Doctor of Philosophy on Church Admin." in 2000. It further shows that the college is "Accredited by the National Association of Private Nontraditional Schools and Colleges". The HR department was unaware the NAPNSC's accreditation was not recognized for government-backed loans or scholarships or by the federal civil service at the time of Heinke's application in January 2004.

BLA conducted the employment background checks. Around the time of the hiring process, I learned of GH's employment with MMI through discussions with an area employer that purchased MMI services when GH was employed with MMI. The employer was satisfied with MMI and described GH's function similarly to the duties listed on his resume. I passed this information to BLA. Recent contacts with MMI confirmed GH's employment date, title and salary.

In March 2004, the Pillager School superintendent (who is no longer at Pillager) confirmed Heinke was an unpaid intern who worked a high level, the nature of which was at the executive level and his performance was exceptional.

The department did not contact the employer listed as GDH Consulting as that was GH's consulting business and did not attempt to verify business clients GH listed as having provided independent consultant services. The County typically does not verify business clients unless the applicant's service to the business provides a significant and substantial basis for the experience required for the position at question.

The military service was not thoroughly reviewed. This is not County practice.

GH's application did not include the Arden Hills, Special Olympics or Tri-County Humane Society experiences listed on the resume.

BLA also contacted the personal references listed on the employment application. In March 2004, BLA received a response from the Pillager superintendent (see above). She also

received positive comments from two personal references supplied by Heinke.³ HR was recently able to confirm the Pillager reference, but was unable to verify or contact the two (2) personal reference checks. In addition, no reference check was made regarding the employment with Heartland Animal Rescue Team (HART) as that employment was not disclosed on the resume or application.

The department also queried Google, MSNsearch, and Yahoo Search for "Gary Heinke." The search produced no useful information. The Feb/Mar Google, MSN or Yahoo search did not produce hits on Brainerd Dispatch articles related to "HART" hiring GH or to the Pillager School Board furloughing or hiring GH.

The County subsequently located these and other articles on GH involvement with HART and the Pillager school through the Brainerd Dispatch's internal search service. Neither BLA nor I realized that GH's work at HART was not associated with the Tri-County Humane Society listed on the resume. It should be noted that Dispatch articles from the same time period state that HART serves three (3) counties; Crow Wing (includes Brainerd), Morrison and Todd. Also, the Tri-County Community Action program services Brainerd. GH work as an aide at the Pillager was distinct from his unpaid internship.

The activities listed under "Additional Experience" on the resume were not verified by BLA because these experiences had little relevance to the CSO position and were not reviewed or discussed during the interview. This is the County's normal practice. As HR later discovered and confirmed one of the listings was fictional.

Differences between the 2 resumes

The 5/27/03 and 1/13/04 resume contain several noticeable differences. While it is common for an applicant to tailor a resume to individual employers, the nature of the changes appears to shed some light on the feedback GH received while pursuing the position. In general the second resume adds details about his experience at Pillager School District, expands his managerial and administrative roles at MMI and in the military, deemphasizes local church involvement and adds several new experiences.

Many are understandable. GH's continued involvement with the Pillager School District in the Summer/Fall of 2003 explains the moving of these activities to a separate heading and the addition of the St. Cloud State University listing under the "Education" heading.

Replacing his church involvement with secular experiences is sensible when responding to a governmental posting. Replacing them with fabricated experiences is not. It is difficult to determine GH's rationale or what advice or counsel precipitated the change without talking to GH.

³ County telephone records did not include any record of calls being made to the three telephone numbers provided for the personal references. However, as noted, the former Pillager Superintendent did confirm that he received a reference call. Attempted contacts with the other two references to attempt to confirm that they had been contacted either went unanswered or resulted in a recording indicating that the phone number in question did not (currently) accept incoming telephone calls.

We now know that GH received general information about county government in Pennsylvania from John Espenshade and that a relatively long fax was sent to him from the Commissioners' office on September 2, 2003. Although Commissioner Shaub does not remember sending any fax at that time, it is possible that GH was sent information about the thinking behind the re-structuring the Commissioners Office in advance of the September 5, 2003 meeting at The Eatery. E-mail suggests that GH continued to reach out for additional information after meeting Shaub, Shellenberger, and Espenshade, but all deny providing anything beyond general information (and the Espenshade responses are consistent with this). County phone records show no outbound calls to GH between 9/3/03 and 1/13/04. Unfortunately emails to/from the commissioners' office during this period were not archived and are lost.

We were able to uncover only one instance where GH affirmatively sought guidance on tailoring his resume for the position (September 19, 2003 e-mail to Espenshade which did not elicit a response from Espenshade). However, there were a number of differences, both significant and insignificant, between the first and second resume. Nevertheless, we cannot reach any conclusion regarding the extent of assistance or guidance, if any, that GH received from persons involved with the County before he provided the second resume.⁴ We have attached a side-by-side comparison of the two resumes, which is summarized below.

- The narrative introduction provided in the first resume which provided information about budget responsibility levels does not appear in the second resume. Coupled with the statement in the September 19, 2003 e-mail to Espenshade, this suggests that GH had somehow determined that it was best not to list the amount of budget responsibility that GH held.
- Both resumes use the less traditional style of listing the general degree followed by the course of study. In Heinke's case this style deemphasizes the theological nature of several of his degrees. The second resume includes the St. Cloud State University certification but GH had not completed this at the time of the May resume.
- Both resumes inaccurately list Tri-County Human Society as a consulting client. Neither list his unsuccessful stint at HART.
- The Pillager School District experience is greatly expanded in the second resume and moved from a sub-entry under GDH Consulting to the "Career Experience" section. Reference to work with Public School District 181 (Brainerd) that appeared in the first resume does not appear in the second resume.
- MMI experience – number of employees increased from 150 to 550 and additional responsibilities were added – "administrative" changed to "administration."

⁴ Note that the 32-minute phone call made from the Commissioner's office on February 27 occurred after GH submitted his resume.

- Military Experience – overall heading describing position changed from "Human Resource Development" to "Human Services Director."
- Additional Experience – added (untruthful) claim of service on Arden Hills City Council and deleted reference to church-related volunteer experiences.

Many of the changes made between the resumes were unremarkable and normal attempts by an applicant to tailor a description of his experience to his understanding of what his prospective employer is seeking. Some, of course, were misrepresentations or falsehoods. However, there is nothing in the second resume or elsewhere that provides any grounds for concluding that GH received any inappropriate assistance from County representatives in crafting his second resume.

Commissioner and Salary Board approval

Salary Board approved GH salary at \$80,000 on March 8, 2004.

The Commissioner's officially appointed GH at their public meeting on March 24, 2004.

On January 1, 2005 he received a 1.25% Cost of living increase and a \$10,000 increase in part for the additional responsibilities assigned to him in 2004. He also received a 2.5% merit increase based on his exceptional performance rating during his first year.

His salary was \$97,176 when he resigned.

Recommendations

It should be the expectation of the County to fill all vacancies with the best qualified individual. At times the best applicants are former business associates of elected or appointed officials. At times they are individuals who respond impulsively to a County job ad having no knowledge of Lancaster County. However, no matter how or why they apply, it is important they all are treated fairly. It is HR's responsibility to ensure this fairness. In this case fairness was compromised and HR is deeply concerned that it played a role in eroding the public confidence in the County's hiring procedures.

Federal and state patronage laws were passed because the public demanded access to government jobs and that applicants be treated equally. The state and federal civil service programs were implemented to keep political activities or personal relationships out of the hiring process. HR trusted that the Commissioners' office recognized and embraced these concepts.

In retrospect what happened in the selection and hiring of GH was only a glimpse of what would play out over the next 1½ years. It is clear that information that would have helped insure fairness in filling the CSO position was not disclosed and advantaged GH in ways HR and other commissioners were not aware. Still today, the Board continues to struggle with trust and effective practices that ensure fair dissemination of information. This must end.

A critical element to restoring confidence in the County's hiring procedures is full disclosure by those involved in the hiring process. Shortly after GH was selected it became apparent that prior relationships with GH were not disclosed. Procedures were changed for the process used to select the Chief Administrative Officer. The Board and HR determined that prior to the interviews each commissioner would state any business or personal relationship they had with the applicant. This policy needs to be formalized throughout the County's hiring process. This policy must also require all persons involved in hiring to disclose any communications with applicants about prospective employment with the County that occur prior to the formal application process, even if they do not have a prior business or personal relationship with an applicant.

A second element is to improve detection of non-disclosure and over-zealous job applicants. HR will develop:

- a revised application that requires applicants to list all employment;
- policies that require departments to retain interview notes;
- a standardized form for reference checking and a policy that require the department/HR to retain copies of the forms;
- procedures that will require departments to separate reference checking from the interview process, i.e. have different people perform these two functions. (In smaller departments HR can provide assistance with the second step); and
- procedures for a review of all communications with prospective candidates so that a comparison between earlier statements and those made at time of consideration can be made.