

**At a Personnel Committee Meeting of the
Sussex County Board of Supervisors
Held in the Conference Room
Prince George Electric Cooperative on
Monday, March 4, 2019 at 1:00 pm**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

C. E. Fly, Sr.
Alfred G. Futrell
Susan B. Seward, Ex Officio
Rufus E. Tyler, Sr.

STAFF PRESENT:

Vandy V. Jones, III, County Administrator
Millard D. Stith, Independent Consultant
Steve White, BOS Tie Breaker
Deste J. Cox, Treasurer
Brenda H. Drew, Housing Coordinator
Ernest Giles, Sheriff
Kelly W. Moore, Director of Finance
Shilton R. Butts, Assistant to the County Administrator/
Deputy Clerk to the Board

Item 1. Call to Order

The March 4, 2019 meeting of the Sussex County Board of Supervisors Personnel Committee was called to order by Supervisor Futrell.

Item 2. Invocation

The invocation was offered by Supervisor Fly.

Item 3. The Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

Item 4. Agenda Amendments

Supervisor Futrell requested to add as Item 6a. Review of Personnel Policy in regards to random drug testing employees and add as Item 7a. A Closed Session Item, Employees Working from Home, pursuant to Code Section 2.2-3711(A)1.

Item 5. Approval of Agenda

ON MOTION OF SUPERVISOR FLY, seconded by SUPERVISOR SEWARD and carried: RESOLVED that the Sussex County Personnel Committee hereby approves the agenda inclusive of adding as Item 6a. Review of Personnel Policy in regards to random drug testing employees and adding as Item 7a. A Closed Session Item, Employees Working from Home, pursuant to Code Section 2.2-3711(A)1.

Voting aye: Supervisors Fly, Futrell, Seward

Voting nay: none

Absent during vote: Supervisor Tyler

Item 6. Board of Supervisors Compensation for Year 2020

Supervisor Tyler entered at 1:10 p.m.

This item was forwarded from the Board of Supervisors regular meeting on February 21, 2019 for discussion by the Personnel Committee.

Board Compensation for Year 2020 had been discussed due to some of the Board members being active in the County. However, no action could be taken until the January of the year of the new sitting Board.

Supervisor Tyler noted that there was discussion among other Board members in regards to an increase in Board compensation. He stated that it didn't matter to him one way or the other.

Supervisor Fly stated basically the he wasn't in it for the money.

Supervisor Seward wasn't comfortable with giving a raise to themselves. She didn't take the job for the money.

Supervisor Futrell stated that he wasn't in favor of it and thought of it as a duty to citizens.

ON MOTION OF SUPERVISOR FLY, seconded by SUPERVISOR SEWARD and carried: RESOLVED that the Sussex County Personnel Committee hereby recommends to the Board of Supervisors that the salaries for the Sussex County Board of Supervisors members stay the same.

Voting aye: Supervisors Fly, Futrell, Seward

Voting nay: none

Abstained: Supervisor Tyler

Item 6a. Review of Personnel Policy

There was discussion of the Personnel Policy and employee evaluation forms in regards to standardizing employment procedures and accountability on both, the employee and the County.

Employees would be evaluated on the anniversary date of their hire. This form would be used for disciplinary action for under-performing employees as well as utilized to reward employees as far as a merit increases based on performance of employees who went above and beyond their duty, in addition to the Cost of Living Adjustment.

There was general discussion on the two types of evaluations: Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) in which any and all employees were entitled and Merit Increase based on performance.

There was discussion that the evaluation forms should be adapted and tailored to the particular occupation being performed such as the Finance Department form would be different from the Animal Control Department in regards to merit increases based on performance. It was noted that a generic evaluation form may not be conducive and may result in an employee challenging an evaluation for a merit increase.

It was noted that the Board would only evaluate the County Administrator. The County Administrator would evaluate his direct report employees. Other employees would be evaluated by their direct Supervisor. However, the evaluation form and the criteria could be evaluated by the Board of Supervisors.

There were discussions of professional development and the effect on the budget.

There was discussion that previously the County hired Springsted to do an evaluation of the County. Step increases were put in place. The merit increase was reviewed but not adopted. For merit increases, the County determined a set amount of money. The County Administrator assigned/divided the money between departments, excluding Constitutional Officers. Then, the Department Heads/Supervisor would evaluate their employees and determine who would or would not get the merit increase in their department.

There was also discussion of the evaluation process that had been in place previously but was no longer in use. The only documentation found was an evaluation form and a copy of the Springsted study of the grades and steps. It was noted that the former county attorney drafted a document to be distributed to everyone. However, the draft document was never revisited.

There was concern on reducing the liability of County employees to include community workers under the County's umbrella. There is currently language in the Personnel Policy regarding drug testing; however, it needs to be amended. There was discussion of drug testing of new hires, as well as random drug testing employees driving County vehicles. There was also discussion of upfront drug testing and criminal background checks for new hires.

There was discussion that the County should consider having mental health counseling in place. It was noted that mental health services are available through the County's health benefits offered to employees. County Administrator Jones stated that he would consult with the County Attorney regarding liability issues in different scenarios and explore information on providing further service.

There was discussion of all Board members receiving a copy of the Personnel Policy to review changes that have been made and make any comments and/or suggestions. It was noted that any changes would be reviewed by the County Attorney.

It was noted that a section on Telecommuting - Working from Home needed to be added to the Personnel Policy. There was discussion of developing the criteria in order to be allowed to work from home.

It was suggested to send the Personnel Policy to an attorney/professional service to review, edit and return to the Board.

It was decided that the Personnel Committee would review the Personnel Policy and provide edits and comments so that any changes could be brought to the Board of Supervisors regular meeting in April.

The Personnel Committee scheduled another meeting to review and make changes on Monday, March 18, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. The location is to be determined.

Item 7. Citizens' Comments

There were no citizens' comments.

Item 7a. Closed Session

The Closed Session item added during amendments was not done. General discussion was done in Open Session.

Item. 8 Adjournment

ON MOTION OF SUPERVISOR FLY, seconded SUPERVISOR SEWARD and carried:
RESOLVED that the Sussex County Personnel Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.
Voting aye: Supervisors Fly, Futrell, Seward, Tyler
Voting nay: none