

MINUTES OF THE PERSONNEL BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 2008
BRANNON CENTER, 105 N. RIVERSIDE DRIVE,
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FL 32168

Chairperson Pohlar called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Chairperson Martha (Micky) Anne Pohlar	-	present
Board Member Dianne C. Shelby	-	present
Board Member Elaine Giannini	-	present
Board Member Robert Chapin	-	present
Board Member Jesse Baumline	-	present

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD OCTOBER 25, 2007

Ms. Pohlar asked if all the members received a copy of the minutes and if they had a chance to review it. Ms. Pohlar asked the members if there were any concerns with the changes made on page 65 of the Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual. There were no concerns mentioned. Ms. Pohlar stated that she did have a question on the appointment and starting rates on page 66 and asked for clarification of the starting rate. She asked if employees start at the minimum rate of the starting range. Ms. Hargy stated yes. Ms. Baumline addressed page 66, section E, bottom paragraph and asked if the City does an independent professional review every three years. Ms. Hargy stated that the last review was in 2005 and the next review should take place in 2008.

Ms. Pohlar addressed page 67, under heading Salary Increases, second paragraph, and asked if a cash consideration would be considered a bonus. Ms. Shelby stated that she did not think it would be considered a bonus. Ms. Hargy stated that it is not a bonus. She explained that if an employee is at the maximum of their pay range, they would receive the increase in the form of cash. However, the increase is not included in the base compensation and it does not count towards the pension. Ms. Baumline asked if the process stays the same for an employee who remains at that level and Ms. Hargy answered, yes. Ms. Pohlar stated that she was surprised that this does not cause problems among employees because this affects only certain employees. Ms. Hargy clarified that the process is across the board for those employees who end up at the maximum of the range.

Ms. Pohlar asked if there are any other questions on page 66. Ms. Giannini addressed section d.a., Salary Increases, and recommended that the wording should be changed from "employee adjustment" to "employee's adjustment". The members agreed to make the change.

Ms. Pohlar addressed page 68 and asked if there are any comments and none were mentioned. She addressed page 69 and there was no comments. She addressed Section VII, Hours of Work and Overtime and asked if the City follows the Union guidelines on break and Ms. Hargy said yes.

Ms. Shelby addressed a concern on page 71, section A, Hours of Work, second paragraph, and asked why that statement was added. She stated that it could be offensive. Ms. Giannini stated that the statement could be more clearly defined. Ms. Hargy stated that this is typical language that is found in a policy book. Ms. Shelby stated that she would not recommend this particular language and Ms. Hargy asked for a recommendation. Ms. Shelby stated that she didn't understand the purpose of the statement and why it was added. Ms. Hargy explained the reason by using smoke breaks as an example and stated that it is a privilege, not a right, and that it should not interfere with the work responsibilities of each department. Ms. Shelby asked if breaks are a problem. Mr. Chapin stated that the policy should be clearly defined. Ms. Pohlar stated that it is better to be more specific when there are union and non-union workers working together. Ms. Shelby recommended leaving the policy the way it is.

Ms. Pohlar asked if new employees sign a document that they have read the policy. Ms. Hargy stated that they do sign a form that they have received it and they also sign a form when they receive revisions to the policy.

Ms. Pohlar asked if there are any other questions. Ms. Giannini addressed a concern for section B, overtime, line five, and recommended a change to the language. She suggested that the statement should state "In emergencies employees may..." instead of "Employees may in emergencies...".

Ms. Pohlar asked if there are any other concerns. She asked if there are any concerns on page 72. There were none. She asked why there is a minimum of two hours of overtime. Ms. Hargy stated that is typical language that is also stated in the Union contracts.

Ms. Pohlar asked if there are any other concerns. Ms. Giannini stated a concern on page 74, number 4, and asked for clarification of compensatory time. Ms. Hargy stated that it is overtime that an employee is not being paid. Ms. Shelby asked if it is at the employee's discretion and Ms. Hargy replied yes. Ms. Giannini asked if exempt employees receive overtime and Ms. Hargy replied no. Board Member Giannini asked if compensatory time was cumulative and Ms. Hargy replied yes and an employee can accrue up to forty hours. Ms. Baumline asked if the time is tracked through a payroll system and Ms. Hargy replied yes.

Ms. Pohlar asked if there are any other questions. Ms. Giannini addressed page 73, standby time, number 4, and asked why an employee on standby does not receive compensatory time. Ms. Hargy explained that if an employee is on standby time and they are restricted to a location they will be paid, but if an employee is not restricted to a location then they will not be paid.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Pohlar asked if there is any new business. No comments were made.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Shelby opened the discussion for old business and addressed the concern about co-habitation and husband's and wife's not working together if one is a supervisor. She stated that this situation should be addressed under sexual harassment and hostile working environment. Ms. Hargy stated that the policy does state that an employee can't work with a supervisor that is a

relative. She asked if co-habitant employees should be included in the policy. Ms. Shelby stated that should be covered under the sexual harassment policy. Ms. Hargy stated that if it is covered under sexual harassment, it would not preclude an employee from working in the same department as their co-habitant in a supervisory role. Ms. Shelby agreed and stated that you would not find out about it until there is a problem and it is brought to your attention. Ms. Pohlar stated that there can be a stricter policy that states that no two people can work in the same department who are co-habiting whether one is in a supervisory or non-supervisory role. Ms. Shelby stated a concern that the situation would be too hard to police. Ms. Baumline stated that an address check could be done through the payroll system.

Ms. Hargy stated that a policy should be in place to address employees working for a supervisor while in a co-habitant role. Mr. Chapin asked if there is a policy in place. Ms. Shelby stated that this was discussed previously and a suggestion was made to not add a policy because it was unnecessary. She stated that this would be better to address if from a sexual harassment standpoint. Ms. Hargy stated that she can find out how other local cities handle this situation.

Ms. Pohlar asked if there are any other questions. Ms. Giannini addressed the previous minutes and recommended a correction on page 2, sixth paragraph, and second line, to the spelling of the word "proagationary" to be "probationary". All were in agreement to the change.

Ms. Hargy stated that the next meeting would be a review of section eight, Benefits, of the Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual.

OTHER BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Giannini made a motion to adjourn which was second by Ms. Baumline. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 28, 2008 at 4:00 p.m.