

## Personnel Committee Minutes

Honorable Council  
City of Newark, Ohio  
February 17, 2026

The Personnel Committee met in Council Chambers on February 17, 2026 with these members in attendance:

Molly Ingold - Chair  
Dustin Neely sitting in for Bradley Chute - Vice Chair  
Mark Labutis  
Michelle Newman  
Doug Marmie

We wish to Report:

- 1. Ordinance No. 26-09** AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION, PAY RANGE AND DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZATION TABLES OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, DEPARTMENT OF JUDICIAL, DIVISION OF LICKING COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURTS BY ABOLISHING ONE COURT SECURITY BAILIFF POSITION CLASSIFICATION AND ABOLISHING THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION OF ASSISTANT JURY COMMISSIONER while CREATING ONE ADDITIONAL BAILIFF POSITION CLASSIFICATION and ONE MAGISTRATE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT POSITION CLASSIFICATION and SETTING THE COMPENSATION THEREFORE

**Judge Stansbury, Municipal Court** - Hello, good afternoon. Madam Chairperson, members of the committee. I'm Judge Stansbury from the Municipal Court. Just to kind of let you know exactly what we're doing and my court administrator has been in constant contact with the chairperson. So, she should be very aware of what's going on. So, it's really a restructuring. Right now, the security team, we have one bailiff and three court security bailiffs. We're seeking to abolish the Court Security Bailiff position for the employee, Krystal Dailey, because she now has added responsibilities beyond what she has been doing. She serves as bailiff for the HOME Court program, which is held weekly on the fourth floor with Magistrate Liston. This does include an increase in salary. We are moving the table—I'm not sure exactly what the classification is—but I can tell you that the added compensation comes to just shy of \$7,400 for an entire year. We are also going to create the position of Bailiff, which is what that increase would be for. The second move we are trying to make, or that we are asking the Personnel Committee to approve and recommend to Council, is related to the Small Claims Administrator, who works with the Magistrate on a number of matters—small claims court and landlord-tenant cases. She now has increased duties because of HOME Court, and in general, we are trying to increase our magistrates' caseloads to take some pressure off the judges, as our caseload is fairly high for just the two of us. There would also be an increase in compensation for that position, just shy of \$6,900 per year. We want to keep the Small Claims Administrator position open; we do not want to abolish it, but it would be unfunded. If anyone has any questions, I am happy to answer them.

**Ms. Newman** – Judge Stansbury, just a question about some of the bailiffs switching from a security perspective for folks in the courtroom and employees. Does that change anything with the status of the types of bailiffs, that their job descriptions from general to security?

**Judge Stansbury** - No, the new position will still have the same responsibilities as far as working at checkpoint, serving papers for evictions, doing set-outs, things of that nature. It's just recognizing that that particular employee and that position is now going to have increased duties because of the HOME Court participation.

**Ms. Newman** – Okay, thank you.

**Mr. Marmie** - Why are we not abolishing the other position?

**Judge Stansbury** - Because it's better to have something and not need it than the other way around.

**Mr. Marmie** - Unless you're on a budget.

**Judge Stansbury** - Well, it's unfunded.

**Mr. Marmie** - But funding can change by just putting it in the budget and with your capacity and what you can do with our budget, just feel that it would be more prudent of this council to not have that additional position if we are actually doing a replacement.

**Judge Stansbury** - Well, the only thing I would say, Mr. Marmie, is that we submit our proposed budget every year, but ultimately you control the purse strings. If you say, "Hey, I wanted to abolish this," and you successfully argued against that, but now you want money when you said you weren't going to, you can basically throw that back in my face, or the court's face, as it were, and say, "Hey, you said you guys weren't going to fund this, but you just wanted it in case you had to revert back to the old way." So that's what I would say.

**Ms. Ingold** - I also, in discussion with Marie Woods, who is the Court Administrator, let her know that that did not automatically mean the position was open. There was no more money to fund it, as the Judge said. I forget the exact words I used, but I basically told her, "Don't add this in next year just to increase your staff."

**Mr. Marmie** - I can't support it without abolishing the position because, across the board, we've always—we don't want unfunded positions out there unless the intent is to fill them. So, given the times, with the city budget being tight and our efforts not to expand personnel unless absolutely necessary, to not abolish that position and leave it unfunded, I mean, if anything, if they need that position later on, come back and ask for that position again. Historically, we've always tried not to have unfunded positions. We do have some, but it's usually in the Fire Department, where we can't fill the positions, or the Police Department, where we haven't been able to fill the positions. So, without abolishing that, it sets us up into a position where it could be funded at a later point in time and the position is on there. So, I just know that we try to keep it clean for HR, for the HR department, we try to keep all of our books clean. If the position is not needed, then the only reason we should have it on the books is if it is going to be needed. If it's not going to be needed, then let's get it off the books.

**Ms. Ingold** - So, Mr. Marmie, which position are you talking about that you would want to...

**Mr. Marmie** - Well, he said he's replacing it. Isn't it the Assistant Jury Commissioner one?

**Judge Stansbury** - It's the Small Claims Administrator position which is currently filled by Lee Ann Ettenhofer. We're asking to create the Magistrate of Administrative Assistant position to reflect the added duties that she has with the increased magistrate's responsibilities. It's the Small Claims Administrator position that we're asking not be abolished but remain unfunded. I would simply say this respectfully, I would ask the committee to forward it along to the entire council so that all ten members would have an opportunity to be heard on that, because it can certainly be amended in council as well.

**Ms. Ingold** - But you are abolishing two positions, correct?

**Judge Stansbury** - No, we're abolishing one court security bailiff position and creating a bailiff position. We're basically kind of just swapping those out. But with the Magistrate's Administrative Assistant,

that's going to be the person who's currently the Small Claims Administrator. We're just asking that that position remain on the books but unfunded.

**Ms. Ingold** - Then help me understand why in the chart that recently it says that we are abolishing the Assistant Jury Commissioner.

**Judge Stansbury** - Oh, I think that's a completely different position. Although Ms. Woods did not brief me on that. I wasn't aware that we were going to be discussing that tonight.

**Ms. Ingold** - Okay. Any other questions or comments for Judge Stansbury?

**Ms. Newman** - I do agree with Judge Stansbury. I'd like to support moving it to full council to have a larger discussion. I feel like it would be a better discussion to talk about funding or not funding a position down the road. Versus eliminating one and trying to explain why it would be necessary. I feel like that would be worth Council's time to be able to talk to that. I'd be in support of moving it to full Council.

**Mr. Marmie** - We've gone through... Before this administration, there were so many unfunded positions. It's very confusing for all departments involved in the HR department. We made a commitment that we would not have unfunded positions. We would not have all these positions out there. It's either necessary or it's not. If there is a need for it in the future, you just bring it back as a position. Don't leave them unfunded, because then it's on the books. The auditor, when they're looking at all the different things, as far as the auditor's office and financing, and looking at our positions throughout the City, we have done a great job of cleaning that all up and making sure that we don't have a lot of these miscellaneous unfunded positions out there. I don't want to support that. I would support if there's a need in the future and they need to come back and the position can be created. That's my stance on it. If we do it for this one, what's the next department? Then the next department, then the next department. They'll want to do the same.

**Ms. Newman** - Just to answer to that comment, too, I believe in HR looking at departments as well. We are looking at funding and knowing what to and what to not fund. If we take the position off the books, then it makes it look like we're operating at full capacity with a position that's been eliminated, that's a little bit harder to go back and say, but we actually eliminated a position that was necessary to make the work happen at its fullest capacity. While I understand we don't want it to get messy and sloppy again, I think it's worth further discussion about seeing that full structural piece of the organization laid out even with that bucket empty to know that if the court was operating at full capacity that that position would need to be filled because otherwise the structural chart of the organization is not complete. Again, I still think it would be a helpful discussion for all of council.

**Mr. Marmie** - We're basically saying that the structure is there now, but because someone has been given additional duties, they are enhancing the position the person is currently in because they're doing more duties and, therefore, deserve more pay because of those additional duties, but the structure is still there. So, they're basically saying that this position is replacing the other position. That's what Judge Stansbury said—that they just don't wish to eliminate it.

**Motion to send to full Council by Ms. Newman, Second by Mr. Marmie**

**Motion to amend to dissolve the position of Small Claims Administrator by Mr. Marmie, Second by Mr. Labutis, Motion passed 3-2 (Ingold, Newman)**

**Ms. Ingold** - It will be amended. The amendment will state that we will abolish the small claims court position.

**Motion to send to full Council as amended passed 3-2 (Ingold, Newman)**

**Ms. Ingold** - I don't believe we have any other items at the discretion of the Chair except for an executive committee for personnel, and so I would ask for someone to make a motion to enter into executive session to discuss a personnel matter.

**Motion to enter into Executive Session by Mr. Labutis, Second by Mr. Marmie, Motion passed 5-0**

**Ms. Ingold** - We will go into executive session, and who we want in this is all of Council, the Mayor, Law Director, Law Director's Assistant, Auditor, HR Director, Service Director, Safety Director, Economic Development Director, Buster Prince, Greg Vickers, and that will be it. So, we're sorry, but we'll excuse the rest of you, and we'll call you back in.

*(Executive Session)*

**Motion to come out of Executive Session by Mr. Marmie, Second by Mr. Labutis, Motion passed 5-0**

**Ms. Ingold** - We will come out of executive committee. We took no action.

Meeting stands adjourned.

Molly Ingold - Chair